## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

+ + + + +

## NATIONAL ORGANIC STANDARDS BOARD

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2006

+ + + + +

The meeting was held in Salons 1 and 2 of the Radisson Hotel Reagan National Airport,
2020 Jefferson Davis Highway,
Arlington, Virginia, at 8:00 a.m.,
Kevin R. O'Rell, Chair, presiding.

## BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

KEVIN R. O'RELL Chair ANDREA CAROE Vice Chair BEA E. JAMES Secretary GERALD A. DAVIS Member RIGOBERTO I. DELGADO Member KEVIN ENGELBERT Member DANIEL G. GIACOMINI Member JENNIFER M. HALL Member HUBERT J. KARREMAN Member MICHAEL P. LACY Member JEFFREY W. MOYER Member NANCY M. OSTIGUY Member JOSEPH SMILLIE Member JULIE S. WEISMAN Member

NOP STAFF PRESENT:

KATHERINE BENHAM

MARK BRADLEY

VALERIE FRANCES

BOB POOLER

Board Specialist Associate Deputy

Administrator NOSB Executive

Director

Agriculture Marketing

Specialist

# A-G-E-N-D-A

NOSB CONSIDERATION AND VOTE ON COMMITTEE
ACTION ITEMS
Policy Development Committee Revision of the Board Policy Manual 4
Crops Committee Lime Mud
Dehydrated Manures
Dehydrated Manure 52
Joint Materials and Handling Committee Agricultural/Non-agricultural Determinations
Handling Committee Commercial Availability Criteria Pet Food Task Force Colors
Lecithin, bleached
Expiration Dates for Certificates
Committee Work Plans
Recognition of Outgoing Board Members 168
Election of Officers for 2007 175
Other Business and Closing Remarks 179

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:11 a.m.

MR. O'RELL: Okay, Board members.

NOP is here. We'd like to start our final day of the October meeting for NOSB. This morning we'll be voting on the recommendations that we discussed yesterday.

Those recommendations that have not changed, there's already been thorough presentation of those. They've been posted. So we can give a brief background and then just read the recommendation and then we'll accept a motion for that recommendation and begin with

MR. DELGADO: Good morning, Kevin.

At this point if you remember the item that
we had on the table was to accept the changes
for the Policy and Procedures Manual. This,
as I said yesterday, these changes make it's an ongoing effort to update annually the
Policy and Procedures Manual. So at this

So. Policy development committee,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

voting.

Rigo?

1	point I would like to entertain a motion to
2	accept the updates to the Policy and
3	Procedures Manual.
4	MS. JAMES: I second.
5	MR. O'RELL: There's a motion to
6	accept the recommendations from the Policy
7	Development Committee. It's been moved and
8	seconded for a Board vote.
9	MS. CAROE: Who moved?
10	MR. O'RELL: Rigo entered it in as
11	a motion. It was seconded by Bea. Is there
12	any discussion? Hearing none, we'll take the
13	vote. Start with Mike.
14	MR. LACY: Do we need to do
15	anything about - we don't have any conflict
16	of interest on this one, do we?
17	(Laughter)
18	MR. O'RELL: No, but thank you for
19	- we all have a conflict on this one. But
20	yes, for our protocol, thank you for
21	reminding me. Before each vote I will ask if
22	there is anybody who has a conflict of

1	interest to declare. Thank you, Mike. So
2	Mike?
3	MR. LACY: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Yes. Hue?
5	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
7	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
9	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
11	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
12	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
13	MS. JAMES: Yes.
14	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
15	MS. CAROE: Yes.
16	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
17	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
18	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
19	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
21	MS. HALL: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?

2	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
3	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
5	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
7	yes. The motion carries with 14 yes, no
8	no's, zero no's, no abstentions. Okay.
9	Thank you, Rigo.
10	MR. DELGADO: You're welcome.
11	MR. O'RELL: We'll move on to the
12	Crops Committee Recommendations. Gerald?
13	MR. DAVIS: Okay. Okay, first
14	item on the guidance document for use of
15	compost, vermicompost processed new and
16	compost teas. We've distributed a new one
17	here that incorporates some very minor
18	textual changes, and I want to point out what
19	those changes that we made.
20	MR. O'RELL: Gerald, just a point
21	of order.
22	MR. DAVIS: Oh, am I out of order?
	NEAL R. GROSS

MR. MOYER: Yes.

1

1	MR. O'RELL: Well, can we start
2	with the agenda just in case somebody was
3	following and thinking that lime mud would be
4	up first?
5	MR. DAVIS: Sure. So what order
6	do you have?
7	MR. O'RELL: We have lime mud and
8	then sodium lauryl sulfate, sulfuric acid,
9	calcium.
LO	MR. DAVIS: Okay. Great.
11	MR. O'RELL: Just so we're in -
L2	MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
L3	MR. O'RELL: - keeping order with
L4	the agenda. Sorry.
15	MR. DAVIS: For the petition
L6	substance lime mud, the one, we discussed it
L7	yesterday, and I wanted to open it up to any
L8	further discussion. Is that proper, if there
L9	are any other comments from the Board on - or
20	we just?
21	MR. O'RELL: What you want to do
22	is to read the recommendation, enter the

recommendation as a motion. If there's a second, then we move for discussion before vote.

MR. DAVIS: Okay.

MR. O'RELL: So there will be an opportunity for discussion.

MR. DAVIS: The Crops Committee recommends that the petition for lime mud to be added to the national list be denied. Stating that the evaluation criteria on all three counts, the Crops Committee felt that it did not pass the criteria on all three. And that it is synthetic, and the substance was rejected by a vote from entering the national list because it's synthetic, it is not mined in the form that it exists. Lime mud is too general of a term. It includes substances that differ from the material produced by the petitioner. The loading rate of contaminants is potentially too high as it is an industrial waste product. The rule prohibits the use of materials made in lime

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	kilns per Section 205.203(c) and (d). And
2	there are wholly natural substitutes,
3	including ground limestone and ground oyster
4	shells.
5	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
6	MR. O'RELL: Okay, I'll accept
7	that as a motion to reject lime mud for
8	listing on the national list.
9	MR. DAVIS: To reject it, yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: By Gerald and a
11	second by Nancy. Is there discussion?
12	Hearing no discussion, we'll take the vote.
13	This is a vote -
14	MR. KARREMAN: How does the vote
15	go? A yes means?
16	MR. O'RELL: A yes means that you
17	accept the recommendation not to - to reject
18	addition to the national list.
19	MS. CAROE: Read the conflicts on
20	this one.
21	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Are there
22	any conflicts with any Board members on lime

1	mud?	Hue?		
2			MR.	KARREMAN: Yes.
3			MR.	O'RELL: Rigo?
4			MR.	DELGADO: Yes.
5			MR.	O'RELL: Gerald?
6			MR.	DAVIS: Yes.
7			MR.	O'RELL: Joe?
8			MR.	SMILLIE: Yes.
9			MR.	O'RELL: Bea?
10			MS.	JAMES: Yes.
11			MR.	O'RELL: Andrea?
12			MS.	CAROE: Yes.
13			MR.	O'RELL: Julie?
14			MS.	WEISMAN: Yes.
15			MR.	O'RELL: Nancy?
16			MS.	OSTIGUY: Yes.
17			MR.	O'RELL: Jennifer?
18			MS.	HALL: Yes.
19			MR.	O'RELL: Jeff?
20			MR.	MOYER: Yes.
21			MR.	O'RELL: Kevin?
22			MR.	ENGELBERT: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
2	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
4	MR. LACY: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Chair votes yes.
6	Motion carries 14 yes, zero no's, no
7	abstentions. Okay, Gerald, if you'll take us
8	to the next recommendation on sodium lauryl
9	sulfate.
10	MR. DAVIS: The next
11	recommendation, a yes vote would be to reject
12	from addition to the national list sodium
13	lauryl sulfate.
14	MR. O'RELL: So there's a - a
15	motion has been made to recommend the
16	rejection of sodium lauryl sulfate to the
17	national list.
18	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
19	MR. O'RELL: It's been moved and
20	seconded. Discussion?
21	MR. KARREMAN: Question. Then if
22	there's no annotation on it because I think

it was being petitioned to be an active ingredient, correct? Of whatever formulation. But if you deny it here, what about its use, I guess, as a minor inert whatever. I mean, does that affect that status? Because the name sodium lauryl sulfate is still the same whether it's in the inert category or this active.

MR. O'RELL: Nancy?

MS. OSTIGUY: If it is an inert, then it's listed separately on the list as under inert ingredients. So it would be covered as an inert ingredient and acceptable as an inert, but not as an active.

MR. KARREMAN: So, I don't have the list memorized, but so it is specifically listed under inert?

MS. OSTIGUY: No, it does not need to be specifically listed. The way that we did that was we put all List 4 inerts on the national list. So if it's used as an inert, which means a pesticide, then it's

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	acceptable.
2	MS. FRANCES: Because the EPA is
3	changing the terminology on that?
4	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes, they are. Yes
5	So actually, that brings up a question. Are
6	we going to change the wording on the
7	national list? Would that be a technical
8	correction?
9	MR. MOYER: From "inert" to
10	"other"?
11	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes, other whatever
12	it is that the EPA is using.
13	MR. BRADLEY: When they make that
14	change we will - we'll have to determine how
15	the Board's going to respond to that, but I
16	would think it would be a - it could be a
17	technical correction to correspond with
18	another legal requirement.
19	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay.
20	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
21	MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, due
22	to the nature of the way substances are on

1	the national list by usage, could we please
2	have included in the motion the usage that
3	it's being requested for that is being - that
4	we are rejecting? Rather than just general
5	to the subject. In the future, when someone
6	goes back to look at our -
7	MR. O'RELL: Thank you -
8	MR. GIACOMINI: - without having
9	to search through what the -
10	MR. O'RELL: That's a very good
11	point. The motion should be.
12	MR. DAVIS: It has been petitioned
13	to be added to the list as an herbicide.
14	MS. OSTIGUY: Well, could we just
15	put it as an active ingredient?
16	MR. DAVIS: For use in crops.
17	MS. OSTIGUY: Can we list it as
18	it's been petitioned as an active ingredient?
19	Because that's really what it is.
20	MR. KARREMAN: Active or inert,
21	right?
22	MR. GIACOMINI: But the petition

1	was for as an herbicide, correct?
2	MR. DAVIS: Correct.
3	MS. OSTIGUY: You'd rather list it
4	as an herbicide?
5	MR. GIACOMINI: That's what we -
6	MR. O'RELL: That was the specific
7	use.
8	MR. GIACOMINI: That's what the -
9	MR. O'RELL: - use.
10	MR. GIACOMINI: And that's how -
11	since we need to put them on the list for a
12	use, that's what it's being reviewed for,
13	just like we have certain situations that are
14	on the list in one case, they've been
15	reviewed as something else and denied.
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Do we wish to really
17	be that specific?
18	MR. GIACOMINI: I think so.
19	MS. OSTIGUY: On everything?
20	MR. GIACOMINI: It's related to
21	the petition as the specific use that they're
22	requesting it for.

1	MS. OSTIGUY: Again, in the past
2	what we were told by NOP is that, and again,
3	the interpretation may have differed, it may
4	differ now, but we were told that if we put
5	something on the list, it was on the list.
6	And what category it was in was less
7	important.
8	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
9	MR. KARREMAN: That would bring up
10	some problems, though, with in crops having,
11	what was it, spectrum? The antibiotic. And
12	then why isn't it in the livestock.
13	MS. OSTIGUY: Oh, I agree.
14	MR. KARREMAN: I mean, just for
15	instance. So I think we should actually -
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Hue, we argued about
17	this at the time, but that was the
18	interpretation that we were told, so I'm - if
19	that's changed, as far as I'm concerned good
20	news, but.
21	MR. GIACOMINI: Well even on this
22	last docket that is currently waiting for

1	final there were things that were the list
2	already requested for a different use that
3	was denied by the Secretary. So I think the
4	use is important.
5	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay. I guess
6	that's how it was done before.
7	MR. O'RELL: Go ahead, Andrea?
8	MS. CAROE: Just for
9	clarification, right now we do have
LO	herbicides that are soap-based on the
11	national list as well as soaps, algicides and
L2	demossers. And I'm just not sure, I just
L3	want you to clarify the use that's been
L4	petitioned as opposed to these already listed
L5	uses for soap-based. I mean, I assume sodium
L6	lauryl sulfate, I mean that's a soap.
L7	MS. OSTIGUY: It is a detergent.
L8	If we want to be particular.
L9	MS. CAROE: But it's a surfactant
20	which is a soap, right?
21	MS. OSTIGUY: No, it's a
22	detergent. A detergent is synthetic, a soap

1	is not.
2	MR. O'RELL: What page are you on,
3	Andrea?
4	MS. CAROE: But it's on 601 which
5	is synthetic.
6	MS. OSTIGUY: I agree. It depends
7	on sort of how we want to do this. In terms
8	of why we rejected it, it was not because it
9	was a soap. It was rejected because the use,
LO	if you look at that section, it is acceptable
11	to use a soap as an herbicide along
L2	roadsides, next to buildings, those sorts of
L3	things. This was proposed for general use on
L4	crops.
L5	MS. CAROE: Okay, that's important
L6	now. I didn't - but - okay. That clears it
L7	up, and maybe we should be specific in the
18	motion.
L9	MS. OSTIGUY: Are we wanting to do
20	that? This is clarification, this is not an
21	objection. Do we want to do that on each

individual thing is to say specifically in

1	the motion why we are rejecting it? If so,
2	that's how we can read the motions.
3	MS. CAROE: It's not why we're
4	rejecting - I'm sorry.
5	MR. O'RELL: It's okay, go ahead.
6	MS. CAROE: I just feel that since
7	soap-based herbicide's already on the list,
8	it might be good in the motion to explain and
9	distinguish from that already listed use.
10	MS. OSTIGUY: But it's more
11	specific on the list. It's soap-based
12	herbicides used for.
13	MS. CAROE: Right, but you're
14	rejecting the broader range use for actually
15	on the organic crops. I mean, maybe that's -
16	that's kind of what I was thinking is maybe
17	just, you know, include in the motion the
18	overall use on all -
19	MR. GIACOMINI: For general crop
20	use.
21	MS. CAROE: For general crop use,
22	yes, that sort of thing. Because I mean, I

1	just - I don't know.
2	MR. DAVIS: The petitioner has
3	petitioned for the use of sodium lauryl
4	sulfate to be an approved synthetic to be
5	used as an herbicide for in-crop use.
6	MR. O'RELL: As an active
7	ingredient. I think we need to, in the
8	recommendation, be specific because that was
9	the petitioned use by the petitioner was for
10	an active ingredient, so I think that should
11	be included in the recommendation. So if you
12	would like to -
13	MR. DAVIS: Restate that.
14	MR. O'RELL: Restate the
15	recommendation, the motion.
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Gerry, do you want
17	me to do that?
18	MR. DAVIS: Yes, please.
19	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay. We are moving
20	to reject the listing of sodium lauryl
21	sulfate as an active ingredient on the
22	national - rejecting for placement on the

1	national list because it is an active
2	ingredient in a soap-based herbicide whose
3	use is more general purpose on crops beyond
4	the categories on the national list.
5	MR. O'RELL: Can I make a
6	suggestion maybe that we just be more
7	specific in terms of the motion is to -
8	MS. OSTIGUY: I said to reject.
9	MR. O'RELL: To reject the
10	petitioned use as an active ingredient for
11	use in crops. And not -
12	MS. OSTIGUY: Why don't you word
13	it because I said all those, I thought.
14	MR. O'RELL: But we're adding why
15	we're rejecting it in the recommendation.
16	And I don't think we need to add why we're
17	rejecting it in the recommendation. The
18	recommendation is just to reject for the
19	specific use.
20	MS. OSTIGUY: Okay. I heard
21	differently. Why don't you make the motion
22	so you get it the way you want it?

1	MR. O'RELL: No. Chair's going to
2	ask for somebody on the Board to make a
3	recommendation.
4	MR. DAVIS: I'll give it a try. I
5	think I understand what you mean.
6	MR. O'RELL: Thank you.
7	MR. DAVIS: The motion is to
8	reject the addition of - to the national list
9	of sodium lauryl sulfate as an active
10	ingredient for general herbicide use in
11	crops.
12	MR. O'RELL: Thank you.
13	MR. GIACOMINI: Second.
14	MR. O'RELL: Thank you.
15	MS. CAROE: Who was the second?
16	MR. O'RELL: Dan was the second.
17	So we have a motion on the floor to reject
18	sodium lauryl sulfate for the specific use in
19	crops, petitioned use.
20	MS. CAROE: Point of procedure.
21	We never - we did have a motion on the floor.
22	It was a motion that was made by Gerald and

1	then seconded by Nancy. It needs to be
2	withdrawn.
3	MS. OSTIGUY: I withdraw my
4	second.
5	MR. O'RELL: You withdraw your
6	original -
7	MR. DAVIS: Withdraw my first
8	motion.
9	MS. CAROE: Thank you.
10	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. So we'll
11	accept your second motion is on the floor,
12	it's been moved and seconded. Is there any
13	discussion? I do have a question because a
14	comment was made yesterday about the
15	confusion and the fact that it is an inert
16	that is allowed and it's kind of ironic that
17	the committee is recommending not to use it.
18	I'm just wondering if there's a little more
19	discussion about the clarification of that?
20	MR. DAVIS: It's on the list, I am
21	told, I never checked this, that EPA List 4
22	list of inerts of minimal concern. But it is

1	a synthetic and the Crops Committee looked at
2	it as because it is a synthetic, even though
3	it is in that List 4 category, it still needs
4	to be reviewed and decided if we are to
5	approve the use of a synthetic on a crop, an
6	organic crop, no matter where it's classified
7	on List 4. I thought that was our charge.
8	MR. O'RELL: No, thank you, I
9	appreciate the clarification for myself and
10	the public.
11	MR. KARREMAN: One other thing.
12	MR. O'RELL: Hue.
13	MR. KARREMAN: Didn't the
14	petitioner also say it's used in, like, human
15	products like shampoos and other things like
16	that? That kind of made me wonder what's so
17	_
18	MR. O'RELL: It's grass. It has
19	grass status.
20	MR. KARREMAN: So the main thing
21	is because it is synthetic and there's other
22	natural available things. Okay.

1	MR. O'RELL: Any further
2	discussion? Mark?
3	MR. BRADLEY: Just for a point of
4	clarification, is it the intent of the Board
5	that you're going to want to prohibit its use
6	in any organic products even as an inert?
7	MR. O'RELL: No. The
8	recommendation was specific that it was for
9	an active ingredient. That's what we wanted
LO	to get in the recommendation.
11	MR. BRADLEY: So if you can make
L2	it clear that -
L3	MR. O'RELL: That was in the
L4	motion.
15	MR. BRADLEY: - not recommending
L6	that as prohibited, but it's not allowed for
L7	use as an active ingredient, but it's still
18	allowed for use as an inert or other
L9	ingredient.
20	MR. O'RELL: Well, that's - it's
21	in the motion that was made that it was
22	specific use for an active.

1	MR. BRADLEY: Right.
2	MR. O'RELL: Is that sufficient?
3	MR. BRADLEY: It was petitioned as
4	an active ingredient.
5	MR. O'RELL: Yes.
6	MR. BRADLEY: Just so, you know,
7	we have something in the record that says it
8	was not the intent. So we have that now.
9	MR. O'RELL: I think we have that
10	now.
11	MR. BRADLEY: I just wanted to be
12	very clear that you overtly stated that so
13	that there was no confusion later on down the
14	line.
15	MR. O'RELL: I appreciate that.
16	MR. BRADLEY: Okay. Thank you.
17	MR. MOYER: Kevin, we didn't
18	specifically mention that we are allowing it
19	as an inert in this motion because that's not
20	what the petition was for. But it's assumed
21	that since it's in the inert that that would
22	be okay. We just - the motion is to reject

is an active.

MR. O'RELL: Correct. I think that's sufficient.

MR. MOYER: I think so.

MR. O'RELL: Valerie.

MS. FRANCES: I'm just making an observation. We've discussed that we maybe should modify this form a little more and I'm thinking that this form should be structured to state what the petitioned use was, even a space for additional comment by a commenter that came up during the meeting and a final recommendation so that you can offer any kind of feedback to that comment and then you can make your motion to what your decision is. Like there's just an order so that it's clear in the record, the starting point, any modification and what the motion is and then you can.

MR. DAVIS: I would agree that the form we have to work with is not completely clear in several ways and we've had comments

from people contacting the committee saying we don't understand what you meant by this.

MS. FRANCES: Yes.

MR. O'RELL: Okay, and that's another subject, but I appreciate that and I do think the point is that we do need clarification on the form going forward. But right now we have a motion on the floor that we're discussing. And Dan?

MR. GIACOMINI: Just to further clarify Mark's statement, our motion is also not restricting its use as a soap-based herbicide for general farm maintenance and ornamental crops. It was only for the request for general crop use.

MS. OSTIGUY: It was not petitioned for what you're describing, so it's not on the list. Therefore, by not approving it for general use we aren't by default accepting it for that specific use either. For the use around buildings, et cetera. That's still not okay. Wasn't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	petitioned for that.
2	MR. GIACOMINI: It's on the list
3	now for that. It qualifies as that on the
4	list now.
5	MS. OSTIGUY: If it is used solely
6	as a soap, yes.
7	MR. GIACOMINI: Right. Right.
8	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Any further
9	discussion?
10	MS. JAMES: I request that the
11	motion is restated just for clarity.
12	MS. CAROE: Can I restate what I
13	have?
14	MR. O'RELL: In the record? Sure
15	MS. CAROE: Yes, because I
16	actually added the listing from the
17	regulation. The motion is to reject the
18	addition of sodium lauryl sulfate to 205.601
19	as an active ingredient for general use. Is
20	that appropriate?
21	MR. DAVIS: General use in crops.
22	MS. CAROE: Thank you.

1	MR. O'RELL: That was your motion.
2	Okay, thank you. Any conflicts of interest?
3	Rigo?
4	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
6	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
8	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
10	MS. JAMES: Yes.
11	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
12	MS. CAROE: Yes.
13	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
14	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
15	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
17	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
18	MS. HALL: Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
20	MR. MOYER: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
22	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
2	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
4	MR. LACY: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
6	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
8	yes. The motion carries 14 yes, zero no, no
9	abstentions.
10	MR. DAVIS: The next material
11	petitioned is to add to the national list
12	sulfuric acid for use in stabilization of
13	nutrients in livestock manure. And the
14	petitioner's representative in his comments
15	yesterday was asking us to table the item and
16	give them more time to do some more studies
17	with alternate practices and/or materials.
18	So the motion I have is that we would like to
19	table this petition.
20	MS. OSTIGUY: Point of order.
21	Could I suggest that we motion to defer
22	because a table we have to specifically act

to bring it back? So the motion is to defer 1 2 this sulfuric acid. Okay. I move that we MR. DAVIS: 3 defer this item to a later date. 4 MS. OSTIGUY: Second. 5 MR. O'RELL: Andrea? 6 7 MS. CAROE: Let me just record The only reason, Nancy, that I would that. 8 see that maybe a table is more appropriate is 9 10 because you're going to be considering more information at the time of the vote. 11 There's precedent MS. OSTIGUY: 12 first. The Board has deferred materials that 13 we want to collect more information on 14 15 historically and it does not require then a 16 second motion for us to even talk about it, whereas a table would require a motion so we 17 could even talk about it. Deferred, it can 18 19 just be put on the agenda. I'm just, my only 20 MS. CAROE: worry is that the actual documents that have 21

been produced aren't the same.

1 MS. OSTIGUY: Doesn't matter.

MR. O'RELL: The Chair would agree with Nancy in this case. I think defer is proper. So there was a second, Nancy?

MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Okay.

Discussion? Joe?

MR. SMILLIE: I'm still a little confused by this. I understand we're deferring it, but the petition is for a material, not a process. The process is stabilizing manure to hold nutrients. That's the process that we're talking about.

There's nothing in that process that's either allowed or not allowed. It's the material that's being used that's in question, in my understanding. So to defer the petition on sulfuric acid so that they can investigate citric acid, to me that would be a different petition. You'd be petitioning the use of citric acid for this use and not sulfuric.

MR. O'RELL: Nancy?

1	MS. OSTIGUY: No. My
2	understanding, what the petitioner is
3	interested in doing is obtaining more
4	information about the alternatives that we
5	are stating are possible for this process.
6	So we still are focused on the material.
7	They're wanting additional information to see
8	if our alternatives are actually realistic.
9	MR. SMILLIE: Oh, okay. I've got
10	it.
11	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
12	MR. KARREMAN: Right, and then
13	they will come back for sulfuric acid.
14	MR. O'RELL: Yes, this is really a
15	request of the petitioner saying we want to
16	pull our petition back in response to the TAP
17	to get further information and investigation.
18	
19	MR. KARREMAN: Okay.
20	MR. O'RELL: Yes, Kevin?
21	MR. ENGELBERT: I'd just like to
22	state that that isn't going to change our

1	position on sulfuric acid, so I'm not in
2	favor of deferring. That's all.
3	MR. O'RELL: Any other discussion?
4	
5	MR. KARREMAN: Just curious. I
6	mean, if there's new information and citric
7	acid is, let's just say, ineffective versus
8	sulfuric acid, wouldn't the committee look at
9	that information?
10	MR. ENGELBERT: No, not on
11	everything we looked at for what this use is.
12	It's not essential in organic production.
13	This is a company that's trying to use
14	sulfuric acid to treat manure that's not
15	standard practice. No one's clamoring for it
16	and I don't think it's appropriate for
17	production.
18	MR. O'RELL: Well, Hue, to respond
19	to your question, if there was new
20	information brought to the committee, the
21	committee would review it. It doesn't mean
22	that the outcome wouldn't be the same, but

1	the committee would review the new
2	information brought forth by the public.
3	Andrea?
4	MS. CAROE: Once again, there's
5	nothing to lose by deferring this, even if
6	the outcome doesn't change. It's not doing
7	anything.
8	MR. ENGELBERT: Nobody dies.
9	MS. CAROE: Nobody dies.
LO	(Laughter)
11	MR. O'RELL: With no further
12	discussion, is there any conflicts for
L3	sulfuric acid? Hearing none, let's move to
L4	the vote. This is to defer. A vote for yes
15	means to defer the petitioned -
L6	MR. DAVIS: Until a later date.
L7	MR. O'RELL: To a later date.
L8	Okay. Gerald?
L9	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
21	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Bea?

1	MS. JAMES: Yes.
2	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
3	MS. CAROE: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
5	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
7	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
9	MS. HALL: Yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
11	MR. MOYER: Yes.
12	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
13	MR. ENGELBERT: No.
14	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
15	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
16	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
17	MR. LACY: Yes.
18	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
19	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
21	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair vote
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

1	yes. Motion carries. We have 13 yes, I no,
2	zero abstentions. Gerald, now we move on to
3	calcium chloride.
4	MR. DAVIS: Calcium chloride
5	petitioned to change the annotation that
6	currently restricts it to foliar use only to
7	correct calcium deficiencies in plants. I
8	wanted to - Kevin? I'm trying to - I'd like
9	- I don't know how to, point of order, how to
10	proceed to offer a minority, what would be
11	anticipated to be a minority opinion, I
12	guess, on - that would counter this
13	recommendation.
14	MS. OSTIGUY: Point of order?
15	MR. DAVIS: How would that work?
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Shouldn't we have a
17	motion on the floor first?
18	MR. O'RELL: Yes. Yes. We need
19	to have a motion first and then open
20	discussion. And as part of discussion you
21	can enter a minority opinion.
22	MR. DAVIS: Okay. So I move that

1	we have a vote to reject the petitioned
2	annotation change for the use of calcium
3	chloride.
4	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
5	MR. DAVIS: I'm sorry.
6	MR. O'RELL: I was just wondering
7	in the motion if we could - it's been moved
8	and seconded, but I was wondering if we would
9	accept a friendly amendment to put the
10	specific usage for the annotation, the
11	listing, in the - 205 in the motion. Just to
12	be clear for the record.
13	MR. DAVIS: What is that?
14	MS. CAROE: It's 205.602(c).
15	MR. O'RELL: 205.602(c). Is that?
16	
17	MS. CAROE: I'm missing a number.
18	No, 602(c).
19	MR. DAVIS: Okay. I move that we
20	vote to - whether or not to reject the
21	annotation as listed in Section 205.602(c)
22	calcium chloride natural brining process and

1	prohibited for use except as a foliar spray
2	to treat a physiological disorder associated
3	with calcium uptake.
4	MS. OSTIGUY: Point of order.
5	Isn't the motion to remove it from the
6	prohibited list? That's what I believe the
7	petitioner was asking for us to do, not to
8	remove the annotation. If we remove the
9	annotation, then it's prohibited even for
10	treatment of physiological disorder for
11	calcium uptake because that would just put it
12	on the prohibited list.
13	MR. DAVIS: No, all the petition
14	is is to change the annotation.
15	MR. KARREMAN: But I think he
16	wants it to be more useful rather than be
17	totally prohibited. If it's on the
18	prohibited naturals list he doesn't want to
19	be -
20	MS. OSTIGUY: Prohibited.
21	MR. KARREMAN: Right.
22	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes. That's my -

1	right now it's on the prohibited naturals
2	list.
3	MR. KARREMAN: Right.
4	MS. OSTIGUY: If we take the
5	annotation off, then you can't use it for
6	anything. I don't believe that that was the
7	goal.
8	MR. DAVIS: Okay. So the
9	recommendation is to leave the annotation as
10	it currently stands.
11	MS. OSTIGUY: Right, to leave the
12	annotation and to leave it on the prohibited
13	list.
14	MS. CAROE: We need to take the
15	motion off the floor and restate it.
16	MR. DAVIS: Yes. I rescind the
17	previous motion. I'd like to make a new
18	motion.
19	MR. O'RELL: Okay.
20	MR. DAVIS: That in reference to
21	calcium chloride, the calcium chloride
22	petition, the recommendation is that we leave

1	the current annotation in Section 205.602(c)
2	as it stands currently, no change.
3	MS. CAROE: The current listing.
4	MR. DAVIS: Current listing.
5	MS. CAROE: Not the current
6	annotation. The current listing, period.
7	Correct?
8	MR. DAVIS: The correct listing.
9	MR. O'RELL: Rejecting the reques
10	for the annotation change.
11	MS. CAROE: No, it's actually not
12	an annotation change. It's a removal.
13	Rejecting the removal.
14	MR. GIACOMINI: Excuse me, point
15	of clarification. Wasn't the petition to
16	match the annotation change of potassium
17	chloride, essentially?
18	MS. OSTIGUY: I think he was
19	arguing that it should be treated the same.
20	MR. DAVIS: Right, but we're
21	trying to get a clear motion on -
22	MR. GIACOMINI: I understand.

1	MR. DAVIS: So it's clear on what
2	we're voting for.
3	MR. GIACOMINI: I understand. I
4	did not get the notion from anyone in any of
5	the discussions that it was to totally remove
6	it from the prohibited list. It was to
7	merely match the more expansive annotation of
8	potassium chloride.
9	MR. O'RELL: Do you have the
10	petition, Valerie?
11	MS. FRANCES: It's on the disk.
12	MR. DAVIS: So the petition states
13	it is to remove the prohibition for use of
14	calcium chloride as a soil applied non-
15	synthetic substance in organic crop
16	production. So that would involve removing
17	it from the prohibited naturals list in
18	function, you know.
19	MR. KARREMAN: Right, and
20	therefore if it's a natural and it's removed
21	from the prohibited naturals list, it is
22	therefore just allowed. That's what the

1	petition is asking for.
2	MS. WEISMAN: No, it's to remove
3	prohibition of a certain - I'm sorry.
4	They're not asking for removal of the
5	prohibition, but the prohibition of that
6	specific use. Even though they use that
7	language, it's the annotation that's at issue
8	here, not the entire.
9	MR. DAVIS: And they are seeking
10	an annotation more similar to what is already
11	on the list in the instance of potassium
12	chloride.
13	MS. HALL: They're seeking to
14	expand the annotation for usage on soil
15	application.
16	MS. WEISMAN: That works.
17	MR. MOYER: That's exactly what I
18	was going to say.
19	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Jennifer?
20	MS. CAROE: Hue's got a point.
21	This is on the prohibited list. If you
22	expand the annotation to be more inclusive,

1	you're expanding the prohibition. If this is
2	except.
3	MR. KARREMAN: No. Except for.
4	Except for annotation.
5	MR. MOYER: And you want it to say
6	specifically that it can be used for foliar
7	and soil. He's adding soil to the
8	annotation. He's not expanding it to be used
9	as anything you want. Expanding it from
10	foliar to include foliar and soil.
11	MR. KARREMAN: But nothing else in
12	crops.
13	MR. MOYER: Correct. Adding soil
14	to the annotation.
15	MR. KARREMAN: So he's adding the
16	annotation to be used as a soil amendment.
17	MR. MOYER: That's the request.
18	That was the request that was in front of our
19	committee.
20	MS. CAROE: It's the exception on
21	the prohibition.
22	MR. O'RELL: Yes, it's like a

1	double negative. Okay.
2	MS. CAROE: I think there's four
3	or five negative exceptions.
4	MR. O'RELL: That's regulations.
5	MS. CAROE: Gerry, do you want to
6	restate the motion for me?
7	MR. DAVIS: Do I have to remove
8	the other one? Or did we ever get to that
9	point?
10	MR. O'RELL: We didn't have - we
11	don't have a current one on the floor, but
12	what I would just ask is, since this is
13	getting a little convoluted with the wording,
14	that when the person is stating the motion,
15	let's pause and take a breath before somebody
16	seconds so we don't have to go back through
17	this. So if we just make sure that we all
18	say this is the motion, we agree, because
19	we'll help where we can. Okay.
20	MR. DAVIS: This is confusing.
21	MR. O'RELL: If there's somebody
22	who wants to enter a motion I would recognize

1	that. Jennifer?
2	MS. HALL: The Crops Committee
3	moves to reject the petition to expand the
4	existing annotation on calcium chloride to -
5	that requests to add soil application and
6	usage.
7	MR. DAVIS: Okay, let me try that.
8	MR. O'RELL: That's a motion.
9	That is a motion.
10	MS. CAROE: To reject the petition
11	to expand the existing annotation -
12	MS. HALL: To add soil
13	application.
14	MS. CAROE: To include soil
15	application.
16	MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, in
17	the section that it's in, should we add at
18	the end of that "as an exception"?
19	MS. OSTIGUY: No, because it's
20	just expanding.
21	MR. GIACOMINI: It already states
22	that.

1	MS. OSTIGUY: It says it expands.
2	MR. GIACOMINI: Okay.
3	MR. O'RELL: So we have a motion
4	on the floor. Is there a second?
5	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
6	MR. O'RELL: Nancy seconds. We
7	have a motion and a second. Any discussion?
8	MR. DAVIS: One thing I wanted to
9	point out is the one reason I see for going
10	through all these very specific wordings is
11	that to remove it from the prohibited natural
12	list altogether, which would make it an
13	allowed natural for all usage, would allow
14	different things such as using it as a cottor
15	defoliant and herbicide. Not that that
16	doesn't have merit, but we didn't - that's
17	not what the petition was for. They're
18	specifically asking for adding soil uses, not
19	opening up every possible use of the
20	material.
21	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
22	MR. GIACOMINI: When - I'm not by

any means a soil expert, and I don't know the differences in usages of these products, but I do know that high levels of potassium is one of the things that we're going to be dealing with in soils down the road and if this is a reasonable alternative to that I think it would certainly - it certainly has merit.

MR. O'RELL: Joe? And then Hue.

MR. SMILLIE: My position is that, and it's going to be difficult to vote because what we have to consider also is the restriction placed currently on potassium chloride derived from a main source and applied in a manner that minimizes chloride accumulation in the soil. So if this ever did move forward, it would have to have that same type of restriction. I think that it is basically patently unfair to allow the use of muriate potash, potassium chloride, and not allow the use of calcium. That doesn't necessarily mean I'm for the use of calcium.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

It just means that I think that the current use of muriate is not in the best interest of the organic community. So I'm not sure how to deal with that conflict. It's not so much that I'm probably calcium chloride, it's more that I'm anti potassium chloride in its current listing. But I just wanted to point out that as we move forward we would have to - if this material was ever considered, it would have to have the same restrictions on it that potassium chloride has.

The use as a calcium chloride is different than potassium chloride. Potassium chloride is used basically as a, you know, mainstream fertilizer to crank potassium into the soil. Calcium chloride is really used as a kind of a desalination, you know, for heavy alkaline soils where it's hard to get calcium. You can't use - gypsum is awful slow sometimes and a small, you know, amount of calcium chloride can get you through some short-term calcium problems until the gypsum

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

can take effect in the long-term soil
application. So I'm somewhat conflicted on
this issue, but I just wanted to point out
that, you know, potassium chloride is an
issue for me on considering calcium chloride.
MR. O'RELL: I have Hue, then
Nancy.
MR. KARREMAN: I'd agree with Joe
on the discrepancy or inconsistency with
potassium chloride and also that there are
salty soils in the West, like Nevada, Arizona
and whatnot that might find this useful. And
it is a natural material, and it is a
national program, so we've got to consider
those other areas.
MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
MS. OSTIGUY: Two things. One is
because there is a material that we might
dislike more that's on the list does not mear
that we should add something that is better
just because it's better than what we

dislike. That material maybe ought to be

petitioned to be removed completely so that it - or the annotation removed so that it's just a prohibited natural. We've sort of dealt with the same thing when we dealt with moxidecton where there was another material on the list that was efficacious but not as desirable, and did we want to put a second material on the list, et cetera. So it's similar argument that we have with moxidecton. This material really ought to be evaluated on its own.

In terms of the speed of release of calcium, the underlying goal of the Organic Management Plan is supposed to be to have good soil quality. And so speedy release of a nutrient is not a goal, especially when you're talking about something that has particular problems.

MR. O'RELL: Kevin?

MR. ENGELBERT: And I understand what you're saying, Joe, and I agree, but we're also along those same lines being

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

allowed as a folient or foliar feeding it is able to correct these deficiencies and still give time for that soil to be built up in a manner more in keeping with organic principles.

MR. SMILLIE: I do agree with you,
Nancy, thank you for that perspective and
Kevin. I'm in agreement with you both, but I
just wanted to raise that issue. But I'm in
agreement.

MR. O'RELL: Any other discussion?

MR. DAVIS: I had one other point to make, just in a general nature being that this is a natural material as produced, natural brining process, that the committee did vote saying that we felt that it did not satisfy any of the criteria, but that in some — in my opinion in some ways that was rather subjective, you know, when it comes to the — we answered some of the questions like on the environmental impact of it as a yes and no.

Yes at higher rates there probably would be
significant chloride leaching through the
soil profile and where does that go. But at
lower rates is that a significant effect? So
it's kind of a yes and no, maybe type of
level. And I wanted to propose the idea at
least that because it is a natural and it is
a - I see it as a fairly limited use material
that would not really make a lot of sense
other than in certain areas of the West that
because for a lot of the country maybe we
disagree with using the material, wouldn't
fit for our area, doesn't make any sense, but
rather than just vote against it, to approve
it. The idea would be to approve it, this
petition, to allow growers in those areas
where they could make use of this tool to
decide whether they want to or not. And let
them make the decision on using it the right
way so it's not detrimental, but it's
actually helpful. It could be an extra tool
that some growers could use in certain

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	situations. I don't know if that helps or
2	not, but.
3	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Is there any
4	additional discussion? And we will have
5	Andrea read the motion that's on the floor
6	before we vote. Any additional discussion?
7	So that everybody's clear on it, because
8	there's been a lot of discussion, confusion
9	about this material. Andrea, could you read
10	the motion that's on the floor?
11	MS. CAROE: Sure. The motion is
12	to reject the petition to expand the existing
13	annotation to include soil applications.
14	MR. O'RELL: Any conflict of
15	interest? Hearing none, we'll begin with
16	Joe.
17	MR. SMILLIE: Abstain.
18	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
19	MS. JAMES: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
21	MS. CAROE: Abstain.
22	MR. O'RELL: Julie?

1		MS.	WEISMAN: Yes.
2		MR.	O'RELL: Nancy?
3		MS.	OSTIGUY: Yes.
4		MR.	O'RELL: Jennifer?
5		MS.	HALL: Yes.
6		MR.	O'RELL: Jeff?
7		MR.	MOYER: Yes.
8		MR.	O'RELL: Kevin?
9		MR.	ENGELBERT: Yes.
10		MR.	O'RELL: Dan?
11		MR.	GIACOMINI: No.
12		MR.	O'RELL: Mike?
13		MR.	LACY: Yes.
14		MR.	O'RELL: Hue?
15		MR.	KARREMAN: No.
16		MR.	O'RELL: Rigo?
17		MR.	DELGADO: Yes.
18		MR.	O'RELL: Gerald?
19		MR.	DAVIS: No.
20		MR.	O'RELL: The Chair will
21	abstain.		
22		MS.	CAROE: Eight yes's, three
	ı		

1	no's, three abstentions. Motion passes.
2	MR. O'RELL: So the motion passes.
3	MS. CAROE: Eight yes's, three
4	no's, three abstentions, no abstentions with
5	the majority, so the motion passes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Okay. And lastly
7	Gerald we have compost tea.
8	MR. DAVIS: Do I have to make the
9	motion before we can talk about the changes
10	that we made to the document?
11	MR. O'RELL: Oh. You can enter in
12	as background the changes that were discussed
13	from the previous motion or recommendation
14	that was posted.
15	MR. DAVIS: Right. From the
16	posted version of the document, the guidance
17	document for use of compost, vermicompost,
18	processed manure and compost tea, the changes
19	that were made in Section - these are based
20	on comments received, the changes that were
21	made. In the definition section for

composting - okay. The previous - the change

we made is a process in which organic matter of plant and/or animal origin is managed to, instead of the word "promote" we inserted "achieve." So managed to achieve aerobic decomposition, not just promote aerobic decomposition. Just a one-word change there.

And on the recommendation section, Item 1, "Compost in addition to that described in Section 205.203(c)(2) is acceptable, (I) made from only allowed feedstock materials." Based on comments received, we agreed with striking the parentheses statement that says "incidental residues are allowed only if they will not lead to contamination, " agreeing with the commenters that that is covered in other areas and this is redundant to be restating it and just would lead to more confusion on what is intended. So that the new recommendation is "Compost in addition to that described in Section 205.203(c)(2) is acceptable if, (I) made from only allowed

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

feedstock materials, (ii) the compost pile is mixed or managed to ensure that all of the feedstock heats to the minimum of 131 degrees Fahrenheit, 55 degrees C for the minimum time of three days."

The last change, also based on comments received, Item 4 of the recommendation section, "Compost teas must be made with potable water. Equipment used to prepare compost tea must be sanitized before use with a sanitizing agent as defined by 21 C.F.R. ' 178.1010," the addition is beginning after that. It would be, comma, using allowed materials found on the national list, period. And that's the only changes to the document.

MR. O'RELL: Andrea?

MS. CAROE: I appreciate the changes that were made. However, in Number 2 under the recommendations you also have the language "will not contaminate." It's inconsistent now with Number 1. It was put

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	in both places?
2	MR. DAVIS: Oh yes, that needs to
3	be struck too.
4	MS. CAROE: And then also in
5	Number 4 the recommendation, I thought the
6	second sentence was going to be "Compost tea
7	must be made with." Is that a rejected
8	change, or is this an oversight?
9	MR. DAVIS: Oh, that was one that
10	we didn't get written down, that's all. That
11	is a good -
12	MS. CAROE: Can you pen and ink
13	this recommendation?
14	MR. KARREMAN: Although I think,
15	Andrea, didn't he say that since this is just
16	a guidance document you can't say "must"?
17	MS. CAROE: You can say "must."
18	You just can't - it's not - you can't -
19	MR. O'RELL: You can say "must,"
20	but it's not -
21	MS. CAROE: Binding.
22	MR. O'RELL: It doesn't have the

enforcement of the law.

MR. DAVIS: So in that section,

Item 4 under recommendations, Andrea's

talking about the sentence, that's the third

sentence. "Compost tea must be made with

compliant compost or vermicompost using the

NOSB recommendation for compost and

vermicompost mentioned above and as defined

in Section 205.203(c)(2) of the NOP rule."

So that we are striking the word "should" and

changing it to "must."

And the other section, in recommendation section Item 2, "Vermicompost is acceptable if, (I) made from only allowed feedstock materials, period." We'll strike "except for incidental residues that will not lead to contamination."

MS. CAROE: So, I'm sorry, I missed that Gerald. You're striking?

MR. DAVIS: In the recommendation section Item 2, "Vermicompost is acceptable if, (I) made from only allowed feedstock

1	materials, period." We are striking the
2	words "except for incidental residues that
3	will not lead to contamination" because it's
4	redundant. It's already covered elsewhere.
5	MR. O'RELL: And after - Gerald,
6	where you said (I) made from only allowed
7	feedstock material, comma. Sorry, but commas
8	make differences here.
9	MR. GIACOMINI: You have (ii)
10	coming up.
11	MR. DAVIS: Oh, that's true, that
12	is a comma because there's more. True. So
13	those are the changes and I move that we vote
14	on accepting this for submission to the
15	program as a guidance document.
16	MS. HALL: Second.
17	MR. O'RELL: Okay, it's been moved
18	and seconded to accept the recommendations
19	from the Crops Committee on the guidance
20	document for use of compost, vermicompost,
21	processed manure and compost teas. Everybody

has a revised version that was given out this

1	morning. We've made some changes to that. I
2	want to make sure everybody's clear on what
3	those changes are. And part of discussion, I
4	think we're going to have some questions.
5	Valerie, have you made the changes? Can you
6	make those?
7	MS. FRANCES: This is only a PDF
8	because I merged three documents into a PDF
9	and didn't bring the original three.
10	MR. O'RELL: All right. Got it.
11	Got it. Okay.
12	MS. FRANCES: Sorry. I'll work on
13	that.
14	MR. O'RELL: Joe? You had a
15	question?
16	MR. SMILLIE: Point of
17	information. I think it's a great document.
18	I'm very excited that we've gotten this out,
19	but I really need to know if there's anyone
20	who can clarify what an angled wedge system
21	is. I have no idea and I used to do a fair
22	bit of composting.

1 MR. DAVIS: That's a worm casting. MR. SMILLIE: Is it a mechanical 2 device? Is it a digester? 3 4 MR. DAVIS: It's a structure of how they do their windrows or whatever you 5 6 call it. It's the way they shape their piles. And that's all I know about it. 7 MR. SMILLIE: Well, if that's 8 accurate, that's good enough. I just don't 9 10 want to vote for something if I don't know what it is. 11 MR. O'RELL: Emily? 12 13 MS. ROSEN: Emily Brown Rosen. That was my question and my comment too and I 14 15 Googled it at one point and it described it 16 as a windrow that you make the compost in and then they keep adding new materials to one 17 side. And so the windrow becomes angled over 18 19 time, and then they take it, I guess they take it from one side as more mature than the 20 But I thought that was a little vague 21

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

as far as what, you know, there's a timeline.

1	Anyway.
2	MR. SMILLIE: Well, at least I
3	know -
4	MS. ROSEN: That's what that is.
5	MR. SMILLIE: Good enough.
6	MR. O'RELL: Thank you Emily.
7	Bea?
8	MS. JAMES: I'm a little
9	uncomfortable with moving forward on voting
10	with this document because I feel that in all
11	honesty as Chair that I'm not sure that the
12	document has been thoroughly reviewed and I
13	want to feel comfortable that the Crops
14	Committee really has reviewed and looked at
15	all of the changes that are in this document.
16	And I think that the Board still has a lot
17	of questions about exactly what some of the
18	things are that are in this guidance document
19	and that perhaps we need to have more
20	discussion before we vote.
21	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
22	MS. OSTIGUY: I'm not quite sure

what substantial changes occurred between when the committee voted on this and today that we've not had it in front of us. If people want to defer it because for whatever reason, that's different, but we haven't done much in the way of changes.

MR. O'RELL: Andrea?

MS. CAROE: I agree with what
Nancy says, that the changes that were made
were oversights, but they were based on the
changes that Gerald already made on the
document. This is a guidance document. This
isn't rule change. And I think the intent is
maintained from the original intent, it was
just a bit of housekeeping to get that issue
that was deleted in the one section deleted
on the other section and the "should" to
"must." This is a guidance document. That
doesn't have a whole lot of change in itself.

MR. KARREMAN: The other thing is public commenters didn't have much confusion or problems with it and they've been waiting

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

five, six years or whatever, so I would respectfully disagree.

MR. O'RELL: I agree with Hue and with Andrea and with what Nancy had alluded to. The changes that have been made are not substantive to the material, to content, the intent of the document. They've been housekeeping, as it's been called, changes. Some of them have been based on discussion from the Board which is our job to do and the other was from input from public comment.

MR. DELGADO: I also want to add that we've been working on this document for several years so we've had enough time to review it and, yes, we do need to add some clarifications and whatever, but I don't think it changes the whole spirit and intent of the document.

MR. O'RELL: I guess I would just say that I want to be sure that we're clear on the changes that we've made and that those

1	changes have been recorded here. Andrea,
2	have?
3	MS. CAROE: Pen and inked them in
4	MR. O'RELL: You've inked them in
5	Gerald, you have those changes in front of
6	you. So if there's any questions about what
7	we're voting on, the recommendation, we have
8	an updated form here, but there have been a
9	couple of changes. I would ask that we go
10	through those one more time just to be clear
11	MR. DAVIS: Okay. First page,
12	under the definition section, composting, we
13	changed one word in the first sentence.
14	Well, there is only one sentence, excuse me.
15	"A process in which organic matter of plant
16	and/or animal origin is managed to achieve,"
17	the word "achieve" was substituted instead or
18	"promote." So that was a change from what
19	was posted for public comment. It's already
20	on the document we passed out this morning.
21	MR. O'RELL: Right.
22	MR. DAVIS: Second page,

recommendation section, Item 1, "Compost in
addition to that described in Section
205.203(c)(2) is acceptable if (I) made from
only allowed feedstock materials." That is
how your document you're looking at reads.
What we have removed from the posted version
on the website for public comment is the
parenthetical phrase "Incidental residues are
allowed only if they will not lead to
contamination."

Same page, well no, it's not the same page. Page 3 under the recommendations section, Item 4.

MR. O'RELL: Oh, there was a change in recommendation Number 2.

MR. DAVIS: Oh yes. In Item 2 of the recommendation section vermicompost is acceptable if, (I) made from only allowed feedstock materials. Again to be consistent with the previous we deleted "except for incidental residues that will not lead to contamination."

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Item Number 4, "Compost teas must be made with potable water. Equipment used to prepare compost teas must be sanitized before use with a sanitizing agent as defined by 21 C.F.R. ' 178.1010. And what we added was, comma, using allowed materials found on the national list.

MS. CAROE: Keep going, there's one more. Next sentence.

MR. DAVIS: Oh also, next sentence in compost tea, we deleted "should," the word "should," and changed it to "Compost tea must be made with compliant compost or vermicompost."

MR. O'RELL: Okay, thank you.

It's been moved and seconded that we accept the recommendation from the Crops Committee as revised and discussed. And there was a second. We've had discussion. We'll call the vote. Is there any conflicts with compost tea? We're voting to accept this as a guidance document, yes. And we'll begin

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	the voting with Bea.
2	MS. JAMES: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
4	MS. CAROE: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
6	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
8	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
10	MS. HALL: Yes.
11	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
12	MR. MOYER: Yes.
13	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
14	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
15	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
16	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
17	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
18	MR. LACY: Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
20	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
22	MR. DELGADO: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
2	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
4	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
6	yes. The motion carries 14 yes, zero no's,
7	zero abstentions. Okay, thank you. That
8	concludes the Crops Committee
9	recommendations. We'd like to move now to
10	the Joint Materials and Handling Committee
11	recommendation for ag/non-ag. Julie?
12	MS. WEISMAN: There was a lot of
13	public comment on this recommendation that
14	was shared in writing before the meeting and
14 15	was shared in writing before the meeting and also that we heard in the previous two days.
15	also that we heard in the previous two days.
15 16	also that we heard in the previous two days.  And there were very - questions raised that
15 16 17	also that we heard in the previous two days.  And there were very - questions raised that had great merit. I guess procedurally should
15 16 17 18	also that we heard in the previous two days.  And there were very - questions raised that had great merit. I guess procedurally should I go ahead and present this as is, or should
15 16 17 18	also that we heard in the previous two days.  And there were very - questions raised that had great merit. I guess procedurally should I go ahead and present this as is, or should I present the recommendation as we originally

1	our time. Right. Yesterday we were on the
2	verge of deferring action on this
3	recommendation, so I think the appropriate
4	thing - and we decided that now would be the
5	appropriate time to take that vote. So I
6	would like to proceed with that at this time.
7	MR. O'RELL: So I will accept that
8	as a motion from the Handling Committee and
9	Materials Committee -
10	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
11	MR. O'RELL: - to defer.
12	MS. WEISMAN: I move that we defer
13	the recommendation relative to agricultural
14	and non-agricultural substances for national
15	list consideration.
16	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
17	MR. O'RELL: It's been moved and
18	seconded. Discussion? I would just like to
19	add that I think this is the appropriate
20	thing to do and certainly the committees in
21	the discussion were wanting to move forward
22	with the concept of expanding additional

organic usage and interpretation of non-plant life. I think there's a lot of good points were brought up in the public comment. needs to be more work done around this issue. We certainly are going to be reaching out to the public from the committee side. It's on the work plan as a priority. I don't think this interferes with the work that needs to be done in 606 in terms of classifying those materials as agriculture and moving forward. We have continually classified things as agricultural without the use of this guidance document. So I just wanted to make that as a point. Andrea?

MS. CAROE: I just want to say
from the committee standpoint from being on
this joint committee I still don't feel that
this is a bad document. I think it still has
merit. However, I think it is the obligation
of this Board to consider compelling
arguments like we received during this public
comment. And we will investigate all of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

those issues, but there may be no changes due to that. We may be just coming back with justification for continuing with this action. And specifically, I did want to state that the issues that are presented that were compelling is one that the comment period was insufficient. So, based on the fact that this is now out there and we can continue to receive input, that's the first thing that we needed to address. need to look at if there would be any interference with livestock operations that use yeast as either feed or a feed additive and we need to make sure that there is no reason to believe that that would hamper this recommendation would hamper that use.

Next, we need to clarify whether there is reason to move ahead with standards for non-plant, non-animal life or if there is, how we can accommodate that in the future and go ahead with this recommendation. And also we need to verify our ability to move

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	items from 605 to 606 as a technical
2	correction based on this further definition
3	and whether that would be acceptable or
4	whether we would need an intervening action
5	of a petition. And again, to further get
6	industry input so that we move forward with a
7	good recommendation although I still think
8	this is a good recommendation, but a
9	recommendation that won't be questioned. So
10	that's my five cents.
11	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
12	MR. DAVIS: Andrea, that was very
13	clearly stated, I thought that was very good
14	how you broke that down, and I was wondering
15	as a part of the Materials Committee, can we
16	get your comments kind of itemized for our
17	work that we continue with? That'd be nice.
18	MS. CAROE: Absolutely. I will
19	provide you with it.
20	MR. DAVIS: Keep us on track?
21	MR. O'RELL: Any additional
22	discussion? Okay. We have a motion on the

1	floor to defer the Handling Committee,
2	Materials Committee joint recommendation on
3	ag/non-ag. So a vote yes is to defer. Any
4	conflicts of interest to declare? Hearing
5	none, we'll take the vote. Andrea?
6	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
7	MS. CAROE: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
9	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
11	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
12	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
13	MS. HALL: Yes.
14	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
15	MR. MOYER: Yes.
16	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
17	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
18	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
19	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
21	MR. LACY: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Hue?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
2	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
3	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
5	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
7	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
9	MS. JAMES: Yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
11	yes. Motion carries 14 yes, zero no, zero
12	abstentions.
13	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, the next item
14	up for vote from the Handling Committee is
15	the document on a recommendation for the
16	establishment of commercial availability
17	criteria. This also received a lot of
18	discussion, a lot of very good feedback in
19	the form of public comments and there were
20	some changes suggested in the last two days
21	on the basis of public comment. I did not

make a new document and I'm wondering if we

have this in a - is this a PDF also, or is this a Word document? Okay. So I'm going to describe the changes based on the original document that was made up for the meeting and we'll have to pin it in.

MS. FRANCES: I'll make an effort to do that next time, next meeting, having all the documents in any form.

MS. WEISMAN: Right, okay. In Recommendation A, which would be the third page, where it says the second bullet point, after listing the types of info that the NOSB will be wanting to see included in the petition. And I would say actually after the note saying that the global market is the universe of supply, we would like to add "This information will aid the NOSB in evaluating the fragility of supply." That's an attempt to clarify what the NOSB sees their role in using this information. Does that?

MS. CAROE: I need the wording.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. Add this
2	sentence after that note on the global
3	market, et cetera.
4	MR. SMILLIE: Is it part of the
5	parentheses?
6	MS. WEISMAN: No, not part of the
7	parentheses.
8	MS. CAROE: Is it a bullet?
9	MS. WEISMAN: Or maybe we should
10	make it before the note. It's not another -
11	okay. I'll accept suggestions as to where
12	the best place to put it is. The purpose is
13	to clarify that we are not going to be making
14	- we're trying to clarify the purpose of
15	collecting the information.
16	MS. CAROE: I thought that was
17	going to be in the B section, in recommending
18	an ag material should be - NOSB shall review
19	the petitioner's claim that.
20	MS. WEISMAN: Well that's specific
21	to - that's a separate thing.
22	MS. CAROE: But the NOSB shall

1	review the petitioner's claim that there is
2	vulnerability or fragility in supply?
3	MS. WEISMAN: If that fits there
4	and serves the same purpose.
5	MS. CAROE: Because in that
6	section you do say that we're evaluating "no
7	organic substitutes are commercially
8	available" which was - that was contentious.
9	MS. WEISMAN: Right.
10	MS. CAROE: That's where we wanted
11	to change that to -
12	MS. HALL: I was actually going to
13	suggest something different based on
14	Barbara's comments yesterday. It's kind of a
15	clarification for myself that if this is
16	truly to put more depth into the process if
17	it doesn't effectively change the committee's
18	role or the program's role as she was
19	explaining I would actually suggest that we
20	strike Section B, that it adds more
21	questions, if we're not changing our roles

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

from what they were previous to this

1	document. And then just include your
2	statement as a bullet like we're suggesting
3	now right under those additional criteria.
4	MS. CAROE: But Jennifer, I don't
5	know if it's ever been clearly stated what
6	our role is in reviewing materials for 606.
7	That's why I think it was originally stated
8	on this recommendation.
9	MS. FRANCES: It's an amazing
LO	piece of technology. You can select text, I
11	forgot. I just put it into Word. So if you
12	want to.
13	MS. WEISMAN: Thank you.
L4	MR. O'RELL: That's good.
15	MS. FRANCES: I need more coffee
L6	this morning.
L7	MS. WEISMAN: You know, I have to
18	apologize for not being as well prepared on
L9	this document as I am for the one afterwards,
20	but I'm like reading the notes in my margins
21	that I made yesterday and whoever said that

this belongs as part of Section B is

1	absolutely correct. So let's just move to
2	Recommendation B. Okay. In the first
3	sentence, the NOSB shall review the
4	petitioner's claim. Okay, the NOSB shall,
5	(1) through technical review if necessary
6	that a material is agricultural.
7	MS. FRANCES: You know, I'm really
8	not clear where you are.
9	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. In
10	Recommendation B now, which is the NOSB and
11	NOP role. There. All right. Okay. Now, in
12	that first line, "In recommending that an
13	agricultural material shall be placed on
14	205.606, the NOSB shall before review -
15	MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, that
16	seems to be a different version than what we
17	are working with. It's certainly a different
18	format.
19	MS. WEISMAN: Well, the shall -
20	the word wrap is just - the "shall" is on the
21	first part of the second line, okay? After

the word "shall" -

1	MR. DAVIS: I'm concerned about
2	the rest of the document that changed the
3	formatting three or four lines worth on the
4	page.
5	MS. CAROE: It's just the word
6	wrap. Same words, just format.
7	MS. FRANCES: The way the margins
8	are set on the page. Her margin thing.
9	MR. O'RELL: It's the same
10	document.
11	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, so shall -
12	instead of "shall" write ascertain, comma,
13	through technical review if necessary, comma,
14	that material is agricultural.
15	MS. FRANCES: Sorry for typos.
16	MS. WEISMAN: And I think we want
17	a semicolon there. And then we go on with
18	"and review the claim that no organic
19	substitutes." We continue with that. Just
20	make that segueway there to the rest of it.
21	Does that make sense?
22	MR. LACY: And Julie, did you have

1	an "if necessary" in there?
2	MS. WEISMAN: No, we want "and
3	review the petitioner's claim." The "and"
4	needs to be there.
5	MR. LACY: I thought you had after
6	"technical review, if necessary." Did I not
7	hear that right?
8	MS. WEISMAN: Through technical
9	review, yes, if necessary, thank you. I
10	can't see that well from this side of the
11	morning.
12	MS. CAROE: I still - we're not
13	going to be reviewing commercial
14	availability. I mean, I don't agree with the
15	after "and."
16	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. So let's -
17	this is where we want to make the emphasis
18	more be on addressing the vulnerability of
19	supply.
20	MS. CAROE: So I think "and" -
21	MS. WEISMAN: Should be struck.
22	MS. CAROE: Strike the rest of

1	that sentence.
2	MS. FRANCES: Strike the entire
3	sentence?
4	MS. WEISMAN: Yes, the rest after
5	- "and" and after. But we're going to
6	replace it with - well, you already have it.
7	Ascertain. And evaluate the information
8	regarding the fragility of supply.
9	MR. O'RELL: Valerie, could you
LO	read that, what you have now and just concur
11	that that's.
12	MS. FRANCES: In recommending that
L3	an agricultural material shall be placed on
L4	205.606, the NOSB shall ascertain through
L5	technical review if necessary that material
L6	is agricultural and evaluate the information
L7	regarding the fragility of supply.
L8	MS. JAMES: You need a "the" in
L9	between "that" and "material." That the
20	material.
21	MS. FRANCES: Thank you.
22	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, then, now we

	nave another small change in Recommendation -
2	In Recommendation C there was concern about
3	pushing certifiers a little bit close to
4	being beyond what their appropriate role is.
5	So to help them out we would like to replace
6	in Number 3, instead of saying "notify the
7	certification applicant" we want to say - or
8	actually, I guess we want to strike that
9	sentence and replace it with "make available
10	sources of information" - make available to
11	the certification applicant or certified
12	operator - I'll read this over again -
13	sources of information. That list. Does
14	that?
15	MS. CAROE: You just have to say
16	make available.
17	MS. WEISMAN: Right. Make
18	available sources of information that list
19	organic ingredients. Period. Number 3, make
20	available sources of information that list
21	organic ingredients.

MR. KARREMAN:

Question.

22

Is that

1	- could that be construed on consulting on
2	the part of the ACA?
3	MS. WEISMAN: That's, we're trying
4	to make it less that way.
5	MS. CAROE: Just for information
6	that is made available across the board is
7	not consulting. Information that is made
8	available specifically to, you know, or
9	selective groups within the applicant pool
LO	would be considered consulting, but
11	information that's provided across the board
L2	is not consulting.
L3	MS. WEISMAN: Those are all the
L4	changes.
15	MR. O'RELL: Those are the two
L6	changes. Jeff?
L7	MR. DAVIS: Read that Sentence 3
L8	again.
L9	MR. O'RELL: Okay. You have to
20	re-read it.
21	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. Make
22	available sources of information that list

1	organic ingredients. Make available sources
2	of information that list organic ingredients.
3	Is that what we list? Available. So we're
4	going to use "available" twice in the same
5	sentence. I know my English teachers
6	wouldn't like that.
7	MS. FRANCES: Make available
8	sources of information that list organic
9	materials or ingredients?
10	MS. WEISMAN: Materials.
11	MR. SMILLIE: Provide, rather than
12	make available?
13	MS. WEISMAN: Provide. Okay.
14	Provide.
15	MS. FRANCES: Indicate?
16	MR. KARREMAN: No, not provide,
17	make available. Providing is like here you
18	go.
19	MR. O'RELL: Yes.
20	MS. WEISMAN: Make available
21	sources of information.
22	MS. FRANCES: One at a time. She

1	can't hear.
2	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, sorry.
3	MR. KARREMAN: Keep the sentence
4	as it is, please.
5	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, I think that's
6	going to be sufficient.
7	MR. O'RELL: Okay. We've had two
8	changes made in the document. I'd like to go
9	back to - Jeff, yes.
10	MR. MOYER: Well, I had a question
11	about another change that I had made note on
12	in my document in the item above that, Item
13	2. There was discussion yesterday about the
14	word "credible." Are we keeping that word in
15	there as it is?
16	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
17	MS. CAROE: As we discussed,
18	"credible" I guess it does require somewhat
19	of a judgment call, but this is a guidance
20	document and it just indicates that there -
21	MS. HALL: As I recall, we said

that most certifiers currently do that, that

1	they make that decision themselves on
2	credibility and that doesn't change anything.
3	MS. CAROE: Right. It doesn't,
4	and it's something that actually the detail
5	of that will be evaluated through the
6	accreditation process as their systems are
7	reviewed and the information that they are
8	making their decisions on are reviewed. So
9	noting it here is setting the track, but how
10	that's actually implemented should be left to
11	the accreditation process.
12	MR. MOYER: Which is the reason I
13	wouldn't have the word "credible." I'd just
14	say that the operator has documentation. A
15	credible or non-credible is a judgment call.
16	I don't think that it needs to be in this
17	document. That was just my point. It was a
18	discussion that came up yesterday.
19	MS. CAROE: I could go either way
20	because it really doesn't make that much
21	difference.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. GIACOMINI: In my

1	conversations with some certifiers, they
2	claim that they don't have the leverage to
3	question documentation in some situations and
4	in this case I think if we can give them
5	something that says, no, Joe the barber
6	doesn't know what he's talking about, that we
7	should give the certifiers that leverage.
8	MS. WEISMAN: Okay, leave it in.
9	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
10	MR. SMILLIE: At this point I'm
11	not sure if it's appropriate or not, but I'd
12	like to get Mark or the program's take on
13	where we are with (c)(3), if that. Your
14	current thoughts on (c)(3).
15	MS. FRANCES: Make available -
16	MR. BRADLEY: From the consulting
17	standpoint?
18	MR. SMILLIE: Yes. The conflict
19	of interest issue.
20	MS. FRANCES: Make available
21	sources of information that list organic
22	materials if the certifying agent finds that

1	such materials exist.
2	MR. BRADLEY: Oh, we struck that.
3	MS. WEISMAN: No, it's gone.
4	MS. CAROE: There's a period after
5	"organic materials" and there's an
6	"available" before the word "organic."
7	MR. BRADLEY: Really?
8	MS. CAROE: Yes.
9	MR. BRADLEY: We wanted to keep
10	that then.
11	MS. CAROE: We need to - this is
12	about available organic materials.
13	MS. WEISMAN: Commercially
14	available? Do we want to say that?
15	MR. BRADLEY: No.
16	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. Oh, because
17	that's what we're defining. Yes, of course.
18	MS. FRANCES: We just put
19	"available" in there twice. That's why.
20	MS. CAROE: No, we determined it's
21	bad English.
22	MS. WEISMAN: It's not so elegant,

but it does the job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BRADLEY: Is your objective here to try to promote the use of organic products?

MR. SMILLIE: No, the objective is to be able to provide to the public at large lists of information, not specific companies or specific products, but where people who want to find out what is available on the organic marketplace. And the certification agent is the one who gets this request. want to remove the certification agent from a position of conflict of interest or consulting by telling people where they get things and instead put them in the position of being able to make available information lists such as an OTA list, an OMRI list, whatever else is available as a generic list of available organic products. So that they don't have a consulting conflict. In other words, they're not consulting the applicant or certified operator on what to do, how to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

come into compliance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BRADLEY: Is this going to be in the context of them developing their organic systems plan, or is it after they have made a request for determination of commercial availability?

MR. O'RELL: Andrea.

This is the certifier MS. CAROE: is making it available just like they make available the list of all their certified I mean, it's just having it out entities. there and available. It's not a response to a request. It's not, you know, it's just information that we feel that the certifiers should have available. Let me put it in an example. You know, the certifier can't say you have to use organic saffron because we know it's available and the entity comes back and says but where. You can't tell them However, if you have a list, a clearinghouse of information available, then it's like, you know, pointing to the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	dictionary and it's already there for
2	everybody.
3	MR. BRADLEY: Are they going to
4	charge to list this information?
5	MS. WEISMAN: No.
6	MS. CAROE: This is just reference
7	to existing clearinghouses of information.
8	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
9	MR. KARREMAN: I think the term
10	"clearinghouse" is important because I think,
11	at least from being out in the field and all,
12	I think certain certifiers are kind of cozy
13	with certain companies and they would steer
14	them maybe just to those companies versus -
15	kind of like an extension service that has a
16	myriad of supplies. Information. Do you
17	know what I mean?
18	MR. SMILLIE: Yes, you're exactly
19	right and that's what we're trying to craft
20	here is to make sure that we get the
21	information out without getting the certifier

in a conflict of interest or consulting

1	position.
2	MR. KARREMAN: No, I understand
3	that, but even on that Sentence Number 3, you
4	know, the lists of organic materials might
5	be, up in Maine and Vermont, quite different
6	than the ones in California. And yet if
7	they're - I don't know. It just seems there
8	can be too much coziness between certifiers
9	and information sources.
10	MR. O'RELL: I will recognize
11	Leslie as a certifier if she has a -
12	MR. KARREMAN: May I just quickly
13	add that -
14	MR. O'RELL: Yes, you may.
15	MR. KARREMAN: They can have very
16	good lists, but I just want to guard against
17	parochialism, I guess, or whatever.
18	MS. ZUCK: Thank you. Leslie
19	Zuck, Pennsylvania Certified Organic. When I
20	read this first it said "notify the certified
21	applicant or certified operation" and that's

where this turns on, to notify a particular

1	applicant versus making available information
2	to my entire clientele. This doesn't really
3	clarify that, though. It just says "make
4	available" and I don't know if it says make
5	available to whom or what, you know. But it
6	does take that part out and that was the
7	important part, for me to give them
8	information that would help them overcome an
9	identified barrier to certification. So
10	that's the issue.
11	MS. CAROE: So, Leslie, are you
12	happy with this change or are you unhappy
13	with the change?
14	MS. ZUCK: Well -
15	MR. SMILLIE: If we added
16	"publicly available."
17	MS. ZUCK: You don't really want
18	my opinion. Right, to whom. So you know,
19	publish, or some other type of wording. You
20	know, make available is really vague and if
21	you're really going to give guidance it

22

should be -

1	MR. O'RELL: If it said "published
2	available sources of information"?
3	MR. SMILLIE: So you're going to
4	make this available to the general public?
5	MS. ZUCK: Yes. What's kind of -
6	it's really unclear to me how this is really
7	going to work on the ground because if one
8	time a certification applicant then says, you
9	know, if we find that one particular item is
10	not commercially available, or is, then do we
11	change our list and publish it again? Do we
12	do it quarterly? Every time we come up with
13	this information?
14	MS. WEISMAN: You're not
15	responsible for making the list.
16	MS. ZUCK: Okay.
17	MS. WEISMAN: There are lists that
18	already exist even now.
19	MS. ZUCK: Oh, okay.
20	MS. CAROE: You're listing the
21	list. You're not -
22	MS. WEISMAN: You're explaining to

1	them -
2	MR. O'RELL: Yes, it's not the
3	certifier's list and maybe we need to
4	clarify.
5	MS. ZUCK: That's what we need.
6	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
7	MR. SMILLIE: Yes, the Point is
8	for the certifier to make publicly available
9	to whoever requests it sources of
10	organizations that have already publicly
11	available lists. The examples I would use,
12	I'm not discriminating, but examples could be
13	the Organic Trade Association, OMRI, ATRA and
14	whoever else is in the business or non-profit
15	_
16	MR. O'RELL: Can I suggest - to
17	accomplish that can I just, I know you were -
18	can I just suggest "make available public
19	sources of information" ?
20	MS. FRANCES: Or even just "make
21	public sources of information."

MR. O'RELL: Okay.

	MR. GIACOMINI: I agree with the
examples t	that Joe is using, I'm just not
clear in r	my mind that this does that as
opposed to	a certifier pointing to a
particula	sales catalog.
	MS. HALL: I think you could add

MS. HALL: I think you could add "and do not present a conflict of interest" or something to that effect.

MR. O'RELL: Okay, I'm going to ask the Board because they're really having problems transcribing all of this when we just have an open, so we need to be recognized and we need to follow procedure, otherwise it's impossible for them to transcribe the conversation. Hue?

MR. KARREMAN: I just want to add that is exactly what I'm saying, what Dan just said. I agree that they're not steering them to specific suppliers only. I don't know how else to put it, but I want to guard against that. I want to make it as wideranging as possible, those lists. I don't

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	know how you can say it though.
2	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
3	MR. ENGELBERT: So after the word
4	"list" add "all appropriate."
5	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
6	MR. GIACOMINI: Wouldn't that
7	include the sales catalogs?
8	MR. O'RELL: Hue.
9	MR. KARREMAN: There may only be
LO	like five sales catalogs that a certain
11	certifier knows and another certifier's got a
L2	hundred for whatever products. It's
L3	difficult.
L4	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
L5	MR. LACY: I hate to jump in here
L6	_
L7	MR. O'RELL: Please jump in here.
L8	MR. LACY: If you put "generic"
L9	between "public" and "sources" would that
20	help you all?
21	MS. WEISMAN: No, I don't think
22	so.

1	MS. OSTIGUY: Can I make a
2	suggestion?
3	MR. O'RELL: Yes, Nancy.
4	MS. OSTIGUY: Since there's no
5	motion yet could we defer this until after
6	the coffee break and then there could be an
7	argument at that point during the coffee
8	break and we come back with suggested wording
9	rather than this?
10	MR. O'RELL: I appreciate that,
11	Nancy. Let's take a 10 - 15 minute break,
12	and let's let the appropriate people get
13	together and make the correct wording, come
14	back and we'll have it on the screen and
15	we'll introduce it as a recommendation.
16	Thank you, Nancy.
17	Whereupon, the foregoing matter
18	went off the record at 9:53 a.m. and went
19	back on the record at 10:09 a.m.)
20	MR. O'RELL: Okay Board members,
21	we have a quorum so we are going to continue
22	after that brief pause Julie would you

lead us through. I think we've made revisions to the recommendation that we would like to put forward. Could you walk us through those changes?

MS. WEISMAN: Okay. If Valerie wouldn't mind putting us back into B there are two changes now. B is now reading - actually, I'm going to have to move and use somebody's mic because I would rather read what's there than -

MR. O'RELL: Go around.

MS. WEISMAN: So now B, Section B of the recommendation is going to read regarding the NOSB NOP role in the review of petitions, "In recommending that an agricultural material should be placed on Section 205.606, the NOSB shall ascertain through technical review, if necessary, that the material is agricultural and evaluate the information regarding the fragility of supply." That's the change.

Now, let's scroll down to Section

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	C. We had just a very intense side bar and
2	we are not able to come up with wording that
3	meets everybody's concerns at this time. And
4	so rather than possibly needing to defer the
5	entire document, we are going to strike
6	Number 3 right now. And it will be part of
7	our work plan to address that as an amendment
8	later. And that's it. That's the document.
9	MR. GIACOMINI: We need to reorder
10	4 and 5.
11	MS. WEISMAN: Oh, so 4 becomes 3.
12	MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Dan.
13	Okay, Julie, would you like to enter a motion
14	that we accept the recommendation?
15	MS. WEISMAN: I enter a motion
16	that we accept the recommendation as now
17	presented with the right numbering.
18	MR. O'RELL: The recommendation
19	for -
20	MS. CAROE: Second.
21	MR. O'RELL: - the establishment
22	of commercial availability -

1	MS. WEISMAN: I move that the
2	Board accepts this recommendation for the
3	establishment of commercial availability
4	criteria. I'm doing that from memory, is
5	that okay?
6	MR. O'RELL: That's fine.
7	MS. WEISMAN: Okay.
8	MR. O'RELL: And there was a
9	second?
LO	MS. CAROE: Yes. I need to
11	capture that motion.
L2	MR. O'RELL: Andrea's capturing
L3	the motion.
L4	(Laughter)
L5	MR. O'RELL: So we have a motion
L6	on the floor. It's been moved and seconded
L7	that we accept the recommendation from the
L8	Handling Committee for the establishment of
L9	commercial availability criteria as a
20	guidance document. Discussion, please. I
21	think we've had thorough discussion, so

hearing none, is there any conflict of

1	interest?
2	MR. KARREMAN: Not on conflict of
3	interest. I think Katherine wanted to know
4	who seconded the motion
5	MS. CAROE: I did.
6	MR. O'RELL: Andrea. Okay, we
7	will begin the vote. Julie?
8	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
10	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
11	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
12	MS. HALL: Yes.
13	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
14	MR. MOYER: Yes.
15	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
16	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
17	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
18	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
20	MR. LACY: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
22	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
2	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
4	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
6	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
8	MS. JAMES: Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
10	yes. Andrea, I'm sorry.
11	MS. CAROE: I vote yes too.
12	MR. O'RELL: Okay, Andrea. And
13	the Chair votes yes. Fourteen yes's, no
14	no's, no abstentions. The motion carries.
15	Okay, next?
16	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. The next item
17	on the Handling Committee agenda was the
18	final recommendation for colors synthetic.
19	MR. O'RELL: Pet food.
20	MS. WEISMAN: Oh, I'm so sorry.
21	Yes, okay. This was a recommendation that we
22	accept the interim report of the Pet Food

1	Task Force that was presented to us in April
2	at the April meeting and that we now begin to
3	use that document to move forward with pet
4	food standards.
5	MR. O'RELL: And is that a motion?
6	MS. WEISMAN: That is a motion to
7	accept the recommendation of the Handling
8	Committee, yes.
9	MS. CAROE: To accept the interim
10	recommendation of the Pet Food Task Force for
11	further work by the Handling Committee.
12	MS. JAMES: Second.
13	MR. O'RELL: It was seconded by
14	Bea. So we have a motion and a second. Any
15	discussion? Any conflicts of interest?
16	Everybody likes pets. Nancy?
17	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
18	MS. HALL: Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
20	MR. MOYER: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
22	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL:	Dan?
2	MR. GIACOMIN	I: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL:	Mike?
4	MR. LACY: Y	es.
5	MR. O'RELL:	Hue?
6	MR. KARREMAN	: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL:	Rigo?
8	MR. DELGADO:	Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL:	Gerald?
10	MR. DAVIS:	Yes.
11	MR. O'RELL:	Joe?
12	MR. SMILLIE:	Yes.
13	MR. O'RELL:	Bea?
14	MS. JAMES:	Yes.
15	MR. O'RELL:	Andrea?
16	MS. CAROE:	Yes.
17	MR. O'RELL:	Julie?
18	MS. WEISMAN:	Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL:	And the Chair votes
20	yes. Fourteen yes's, m	otion carries. Now
21	colors.	
22	MS WEISMAN:	Thic was a final

1	recommendation coming out of sunset review
2	regarding colors non-synthetic on Section
3	205.605(a) of the national list. And
4	although we have heard comments, we have had
5	a bit of comment on this, and there is a
6	question about disruptions that may happen if
7	these colors sunset. Unfortunately, we
8	believe, the Handling Committee believes that
9	this is a procedural issue regarding the fact
10	that they appeared on the national list
11	without any recommendation from the NOSB in
12	the first place and that because of this we
13	are not in a position to renew these colors
14	for another five years on the list. So
15	therefore I move that the full Board accept
16	the recommendation of the Handling Committee
17	that colors non-synthetic sources only not be
18	renewed on Section 205.605(a) and effective
19	the sunset date of October 22, 2007.
20	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.

going to offer re-wording of the motion.

Sorry. I was just

MS. CAROE:

21

1	Just to keep the motion brief, I had to
2	accept the recommendation to sunset the
3	205.605(a) listing of colors.
4	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: It's been -
6	MS. WEISMAN: I withdraw my
7	motion. Okay, I accept.
8	MR. O'RELL: And Nancy has
9	seconded. Thank you. Discussion on colors?
LO	Dan.
11	MR. GIACOMINI: I would just like
L2	clarification on this issue of this being a
L3	technical matter that essentially we're
L4	required to vote to take it off because of
L5	some procedural issue five years ago. I
L6	mean, I keep hearing that this is a directive
L7	from the program. I'd like some
L8	clarification on that.
L9	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
20	MS. OSTIGUY: I don't know about
21	it being a directive for the program or not,
22	but it's actually, and probably the key role

for the Board is the placement and removal of materials from the national list. OFTHA very specifically gave that authority to the Board. No other way except by this I guess recent legislation can you put materials on a national list. So at the time the Board never acted on this and so this material does not belong on the list.

MR. O'RELL: Hue?

MR. KARREMAN: Just wondering are there any other materials on the national list that came on like this particular thing?

Not one. Every single one had a TAP review no matter how pathetic way back when?

(Laughter)

MR. KARREMAN: I'm sorry. They've gotten very good now. They've gotten very, very good. But I always hear people worrying about the old TAPs. But every single material had a TAP review, went through the whole procedural process except colors non-synthetic? That's hard to believe.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. O'RELL: Jeff.
2	MR. MOYER: Joe, do you know
3	potassium sulfate, did that get on the same
4	way?
5	MR. O'RELL: It's a natural.
6	MR. MOYER: Oh it's not on this
7	list, right.
8	MR. SMILLIE: Potassium sulfate is
9	from lime sources.
10	MR. O'RELL: Valerie, do you?
11	MS. FRANCES: I don't think the
12	only point is that there was a TAP review,
13	it's that there was never a Board
14	recommendation.
15	MR. O'RELL: That's the key.
16	There was not a petition for colors. Colors
17	was never petitioned.
18	MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, I
19	still don't understand. It's on the list.
20	We're being asked to evaluate whether it
21	should stay on the list or be removed from
22	the list. Since it's on the list, the Board

decided not to take action five years ago. I don't see what the issue on that is forcing our vote.

MR. O'RELL: Nancy?

MS. OSTIGUY: No, actually the Board has repeatedly tried to deal with these issues of materials that they were supposed to go through the process. And it was not corrected, at least in my opinion. So it was asked for before and it was not corrected.

MR. O'RELL: Andrea?

MS. CAROE: Just because we're sunsetting this listing doesn't mean we're prohibiting the use of colors in the future.

This action, as you remember from the April meeting, was to elicit the petitions to get the petition and the whole process buttoned up. And we did get that response and we've made a commitment to those petitioners that we will do everything within our abilities to get this reviewed and appropriately listed or not in the future. But as for this listing,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

this is the right thing to do is to let it sunset.

MR. O'RELL: Julie?

MS. WEISMAN: And also I want to clarify. It may not need clarification, so I apologize, but we are not - this is not a recommendation to remove colors, it's a recommendation to allow it to sunset and in the meantime we already have petitions for colors to consider.

MR. GIACOMINI: I just, I have a,
I feel a real difference when I am just
making a decision of whether to sunset an
item or being told that the vote needs to be
in a certain - come to a certain conclusion
because of something that the Board did or
did not do, however something happened five
years ago. It seems the decision should be
made on the validity of colors being on the
list now whether it's colors or any other
substance that would be on the national list.
If it was something that needed to stay on

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the national list, would we be forced in the same situation to take it off and sunset it simply because of a procedure five years ago?

I understand the value of procedure, but I think this would be a bad precedent.

MR. O'RELL: The Chair is going to - Jennifer, I have you next, but the Chair is going to recognize Kim Dietz as former

Materials Committee Chair on the NOSB.

MS. DIETZ: Kim Dietz. Just trying to give you a little bit of historical perspective because I think that will help you. For five years the public, most people have known colors has been an issue, so we have gone out there publicly saying petition, it may come up for sunset. I think the people have had adequate time to make a decision to petition if they wanted to. And we have seen those petitions come in.

Procedurally, it's the right thing to do.

For four years we've been talking about sunset, so it's not just a matter of giving

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

people time for colors because they've had the time.

MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?

MS. HALL: This is in response to Dan. I actually see this as the opportunity that the Board never had to determine the validity of these non-organic colors being on the list. And that they've never - and I think for me the key is that they are not organic and that was never assessed, their validity to be in organic products.

MR. O'RELL: Dan, one of the challenges we face in my opinion is that I would love to see colors remain on the list because obviously there are some things that really need to happen quickly between now and June with the Harvey case to continue commerce as we know it. But this is a procedural issue. This is something that can be challenged. And if we go forward with the recommendation of leaving colors on there and the public then has a false sense of

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	security, it can be challenged legally and
2	that's not going to be a good thing either
3	for the industry. So procedurally I do agree
4	with what Kim has said, I agree with what
5	Nancy has said.
6	MR. GIACOMINI: The issue of
7	Harvey is a 606 issue.
8	MS. CAROE: This is not a Harvey
9	issue.
10	MR. GIACOMINI: This is not a
11	Harvey issue, this is 605. These are
12	synthetics, not the naturals.
13	MR. O'RELL: Well, it's -
14	MR. GIACOMINI: This could have
15	been petitioned to be taken off at any point
16	in time.
17	MR. O'RELL: Right. It's in
18	regard to those materials that are being
19	petitioned now for 606 to replace colors on
20	605. I recognize the placement of the
21	colors, but right now we have a number of

petitions in 606 that need to be out there

1	because when colors sunsets, there's going to
2	be an issue. Hue?
3	MR. GIACOMINI: Mr. Chairman, I
4	would just I guess put on the record that for
5	clarity I will vote to keep colors on the
6	list not as a matter - not as a view on the
7	colors issue, but on the view of the
8	procedural matter that I seem to feel that
9	we're getting a little arm-twisting on.
10	MR. O'RELL: Okay. No further
11	discussion? Hue.
12	MR. KARREMAN: Just one thing on
13	what Jennifer said very well, you know, now
14	is our time to speak up on this material so
15	we can speak up either way.
16	MR. GIACOMINI: I agree with you
17	on that but we haven't had that discussion.
18	All we've been told is it needs to come off
19	because of a procedural issue five years ago.
20	We have not had any discussion on it.
21	MR. O'RELL: That's the
22	recommendation and the discussion period is

1	now. So we're having that discussion.
2	MR. GIACOMINI: Okay, on that
3	issue I don't - we have been pushed in this
4	direction of it being procedural for so long
5	we haven't had the discussion and I don't
6	think that saying this is it is a real fair
7	platform for giving both sides an
8	opportunity.
9	MR. O'RELL: Is there any further
10	discussion? Hearing none I'll ask is there
11	any conflict of interest? Hearing none we'll
12	take the vote. We have a motion on the floor
13	to accept - Andrea, would you read the
14	motion?
15	MS. CAROE: To accept the
16	recommendation to sunset the 205.605(a)
17	listing of colors.
18	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Jennifer
19	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
20	MS. HALL: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
22	MR. MOYER: Yes.

MR.	O'RELL: Kevin?
MR.	ENGELBERT: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Dan?
MR.	GIACOMINI: No.
MR.	O'RELL: Mike?
MR.	LACY: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Hue?
MR.	KARREMAN: No.
MR.	O'RELL: Rigo?
MR.	DELGADO: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Gerald?
MR.	DAVIS: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Joe?
MR.	SMILLIE: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Bea?
MS.	JAMES: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Andrea?
MS.	CAROE: Yes.
MR.	O'RELL: Julie?
MS.	WEISMAN: Yes.
	WEISMAN: Yes. O'RELL: Nancy?
	MR.

MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes yes. Twelve yes, two no's. Lecithin, bleached.

MS. WEISMAN: Yes, actually we have a revised recommendation from the recommendation that was presented yesterday which I think everyone is going to be able to see on the screen. Based on public comment that was received prior to this meeting of a very detailed and higher quality than we had ever had before, we have actually - we feel that we have to reverse the recommendation as it was presented yesterday and that while we've seen that there is a variety of both non-synthetic and organic sources now for liquid bleached lecithin, there are no such alternatives for dry de-oiled bleached lecithin. And although we would love to have the option to not renew the liquid forms and just renew the dry forms, this is sunset and we are not allowed to make annotations during Therefore, we feel our only this time.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	choice right now is to recommend the renewal
2	of lecithin, bleached and we strongly hope
3	that a petition will be presented in short
4	order to restrict the use of bleached
5	lecithin to dry forms only. I think there
6	may be a word that doesn't belong there.
7	There's a typo at the end. That "however"
8	needs to come out. Thank you. Delete. So
9	the Board - the recommendation of the Board,
10	the Handling Committee recommends renewing
11	the following substance in this use category,
12	lecithin, bleached. 205.605(b), synthetics
13	allowed.
14	MR. O'RELL: That is a motion.
15	MS. CAROE: I'll second.
16	MR. O'RELL: Andrea seconds.
17	Discussion?
18	MR. SMILLIE: Yes, I'm comfortable
19	with our reversal because I think the market
20	will eventually make the correction that we
21	think is appropriate and it'll make that

correction in due time.

MR. O'RELL: Gerald?

MR. DAVIS: From my point of view and looking at some of the testimony yesterday on how the dry powdered lecithin, bleached lecithin is extracted and then purified, I know I will vote against this because I think there is a point at some point personally I feel that you can't make an organic product out of everything.

There's some things that if it can't be made without using a material like that, so be it.

MR. O'RELL: Andrea?

MS. CAROE: I'd just remind the
Board that this is sunset. This is not new
information. There's no new availability of
other materials. This is looking at a prior
Board decision, looking for that new
information and determining whether it is
still valid. There is no new information on
this. There's no new availability. So I
mean if we were looking at this material to
be listed, your concerns would be worthy and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	we would be looking at those things. But
2	based on we're looking at sunset, it's a
3	whole different ball of wax.
4	MR. O'RELL: Any further
5	discussion? Hearing none I'll ask if there's
6	any conflict of interest on lecithin,
7	bleached. We will take the vote. Andrea,
8	would you read the motion again just so we're
9	clear?
LO	MS. CAROE: The motion is to renew
11	the 205.605(b) listing of lecithin, bleached.
12	MR. O'RELL: Okay, thank you. We
L3	have the motion and we'll start the vote with
L4	Jeff.
L5	MR. MOYER: Yes.
L6	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
L7	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
L8	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
L9	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
21	MR. LACY: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Hue?

1	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
2	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
3	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
5	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
7	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
9	MS. JAMES: No.
10	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
11	MS. CAROE: Yes.
12	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
13	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
14	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
15	MS. OSTIGUY: No.
16	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
17	MS. HALL: Yes.
18	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
19	yes.
20	MS. CAROE: The vote is 11-3-0-0.
21	MR. O'RELL: 11-3-0-0, motion
22	carries. Thank you. Thank you, Julie. That

concludes the recommendations from the

Handling Committee. We'll move forward with

the Compliance Accreditation and

Certification Committee with Andrea.

MS. CAROE: The first vote that we are considering is the adoption of the quidance document in regards to private label. This document was reviewed again, reread, and the 2001, not 2007, document was also read. And it was determined that they are not in conflict to each other. Knowing that, we also recognize that the 2001 document needs to be followed up with, and that will be a work item, work plan item for this committee. However, since there is not that conflict at this time, we would like to move forward with the O&A as a quidance document as was originally presented. Motion is to accept the private label Q&A document as a quidance.

MS. JAMES: I second.

MR. O'RELL: It's been moved and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	seconded by Bea. Discussion on the Q&A
2	question? It's the recommendation response
3	from the Q&A question that was asked to the
4	committee. No discussion?
5	MS. JAMES: I just want to be
6	clear that we're talking about the guidance
7	listing of certifying agent's name on a
8	packaged product. So if you're looking for
9	that.
10	MS. CAROE: It's the first item in
11	Tab A.
12	MR. O'RELL: Any further
13	discussion? Any conflicts of interest?
14	MS. JAMES: Potentially I should
15	disclose that as a retailed that's involved
16	in private label it could be a conflict of
17	interest for me.
18	MR. O'RELL: The Board can
19	consider whether that's a conflict. We
20	appreciate your disclosure according to our
21	Policy and Procedures Manual. Julie?
22	MS. WEISMAN: As a manufacturer of

processed products I think actually probably
I should reveal that sometimes I make private
label products, that I manufacture products
for other entities. I don't know if that
would be considered.

MR. O'RELL: We'll take one at a time. I appreciate that disclosure. Hue?

MR. KARREMAN: I do get private label things made for me sometimes by an herbalist. And he calls things certified organic this and that or not. So. I guess I do have some private label things made.

(Laughter)

MR. O'RELL: I don't think that, in the Chair's opinion, I appreciate the public disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. I don't see where - I would ask does anybody think they have a material gain by voting on this recommendation? So, okay.

Unless there's any other Board members that feel that there is a material conflict of interest. We appreciate the disclosure in

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

,	the public record Ober we will stort the
1	the public record. Okay, we will start the
2	vote with Kevin?
3	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
5	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
7	MR. LACY: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
9	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
LO	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
L1	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
L2	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
L3	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
L4	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
L5	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
L6	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
L7	MS. JAMES: Yes.
L8	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
L9	MS. CAROE: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
21	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?

1 MS. OSTIGUY: Yes. MR. O'RELL: Jennifer? 2 MS. HALL: Yes. 3 MR. O'RELL: Jeff? 4 MR. MOYER: 5 Yes. MR. O'RELL: And the Chair will 6 7 vote yes. Fourteen yes, the motion carries. Thank you. Okay, the MS. CAROE: 8 next vote item that we had was the standard 9 10 certificate information document. document brought to us very valuable input 11 from the industry. We recognize that there 12 13 will be additions to this document including the categories of certification of the 14 15 products. We recognize that there is 16 interest in having a requirement for English on the document. We will further investigate 17 that with the program to find out if there is 18 19 any barriers to doing that. Also, we agree that there should be a list of attachments to 20 tie to the document to its attachments. 21

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

However, we recognize that there needs to be

1	more work done as far as the formatting of
2	the document. We did receive a wide variety
3	of input suggesting that what we had in the
4	document was prescriptive. We did have also
5	many requests to have a standard template for
6	that information. So at this time the
7	committee would like to defer this document
8	for further work. Again, we do this because
9	it is not immediately needed. We do want to
10	make sure that this does serve the purposes
11	that we listed in the document and is
12	available for the certifiers to use without
13	too much hardship. So at this time I would
14	like to motion to defer the document on
15	standard certificate format.
16	MS. HALL: Second.
17	MR. O'RELL: It's been moved and
18	seconded by Jennifer. Do we have discussion?
19	Joe?
20	MR. SMILLIE: Yes. On the issue

of the prescriptive, you know, we talked

about the 8.5x11 with three inches at the

21

bottom and we got a real range of opinion on that. Some people said that was too prescriptive and then other people said we wanted a template. I just wondered which direction you want to head?

MS. CAROE: I want to head into investigating it further since it is confused at this point.

MR. SMILLIE: Okay.

MR. O'RELL: Nancy?

MS. OSTIGUY: I'd like to offer that actually those two recommendations aren't necessarily contradictory. If you are given a list of requirements that you have to meet but you are going to have to make up the form, that can be much more time-consuming than looking at a recommended document and saying, okay, that works but we need this little bit of information in there. So I can see how a template can be incredibly useful. You can adopt it wholesale, you can make minor changes if we don't want to be

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	absolutely prescriptive, but you don't have
2	to go through the work of figuring out the
3	layout. So.
4	MS. CAROE: Thank you.
5	MR. O'RELL: Any additional
6	discussion? Hearing none, I'll ask if there
7	are any conflicts of interest? We have a
8	motion to defer the recommendation. Andrea,
9	would you read the motion one more time?
LO	MS. CAROE: The motion is to defer
11	for further committee work - defer the
L2	recommendation on standard certificate format
L3	for further committee work.
L4	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. So we'll
L5	take the vote. Dan?
L6	MR. GIACOMINI: Yes.
L7	MR. O'RELL: Mike?
L8	MR. LACY: Yes.
L9	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
20	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
21	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
22	MR. DELGADO: Yes.

1	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
2	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
3	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
4	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
5	MR. O'RELL: Bea?
6	MS. JAMES: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
8	MS. CAROE: Yes.
9	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
LO	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
11	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
12	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
L3	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
L4	MS. HALL: Yes.
L5	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
L6	MR. MOYER: Yes.
L7	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
L8	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
L9	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
20	yes. The motion to defer carries, 14 yes.
21	Last one.
22	MS. CAROE: Okay. The last

1	document that we have for vote is the
2	document for rule change to require
3	expiration dates on certificates. Again, I
4	just want to reiterate this is expiration of
5	the document, not expiration of the
6	certification. And at this point the
7	committee is prepared to move forward and
8	offer this for vote to accept the
9	recommendation as written, no changes.
10	MS. OSTIGUY: Second.
11	MR. O'RELL: We have a motion to
12	move forward with the recommendation as it
13	was posted and a second. Is there
14	discussion? Nancy?
15	MS. OSTIGUY: There were comments
16	made by speakers yesterday and the day before
17	over expiration, date of issuance and I'm not
18	quite sure what to think about the pros and
19	cons of those various ideas. What was the
20	committee's thinking?
21	MS. CAROE: When considering those
22	issues it did not appear that they - there

1	was no change to the logistics. There was no
2	reason for those. I think the word
3	"expiration" the reason I clarified that it
4	was the document expiring and not the
5	certificate is that's the reason people are
6	getting hung up with the word "expiration."
7	We're talking about a document expiring.
8	Just like your credit card may expire it
9	doesn't mean your account is gone.
10	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
11	MS. HALL: I have two points.
12	One, given that we're trying to make explicit
13	that it's the certificate that 205.404(b)(2)
14	effective period of the certificate instead
15	of certification? Is maybe the word we want
16	to use. In the line that we're changing.
17	MS. CAROE: (b)(2)? The effective
18	period of certification including.
19	MS. HALL: That is actually the
20	certificate, not the certification.
21	MS. CAROE: Of the certificate.
22	Valerie, can you make that change? It's

1	under the recommendation (b)(2).
2	MS. FRANCES: The effective period
3	_
4	MS. CAROE: Right. The word
5	"period" is in bold.
6	MS. FRANCES: Yes. And -
7	MS. CAROE: Change "certification"
8	to "certificate."
9	MS. FRANCES: Okay.
10	MS. CAROE: And add "the" in front
11	of.
12	MS. HALL: Right. And then
13	secondly, that I do have concerns about using
14	"expiration date." From a consumer standpoint
15	I actually disagree with one of the comments
16	that was brought up about it being the onus
17	of the consumer to have to find out what the
18	effective date is at farmer's markets. I
19	think it's a really valuable tool for them to
20	understand whether or not they're valid
21	without having to go look it up or ask or

whatnot like that. I don't think the burden

should be the consumer's. But on the other side of that when it does say expiration date I think that that is a disservice to small farmers in that same situation, that many times they may not get certified on time and may be waiting for that letter of extension or whatever. So I would like to see it be annual renewal date, or something that's not quite as - or annual inspection date, or something of that nature that's not quite as defining, that looks like they're out of compliance where the consumer audience doesn't recognize the additional six months that they might have to figure that out.

MR. O'RELL: Andrea?

MS. CAROE: In considering annual monitoring date, renewal date, those sort of things, it's not apparent if that date has passed if they're out of compliance or not. That's why expiration dates was considered more appropriate because you could be past your monitoring date and still within the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

grace period, or maybe you're not following through with your annual monitoring and that certificate is long gone. It's not, you know. So the expiration date was to be clear for processors and consumers that this was indeed - is not - it is a requirement of the certifiers to annually monitor. And we did put a vehicle in here for extensions, letters of extension, to continue that in those cases where, you know, the crop is in the field or the inspectors can't get out there for whatever reason consistent with the regulation.

MR. O'RELL: Hue?

MR. KARREMAN: I think Jennifer had a good point, though. At like farmer's markets, you know, if you have two farmers and they're both posting their certificate and one is expired it's like looking at two cartons of milk. I'm going to go to the one that's not expired. Is that what you were trying to say, Jennifer?

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. HALL: Yes, or just because
2	it's not as valuable a tool for them to
3	express the validity that they're organic.
4	And I kind of feel like in 205.406(b) where
5	it says that the continuation of
6	certification in issuing an updated
7	certificate of organic inspection on the
8	basis of the information submitted in the
9	most recent on-site inspection conducted
10	during the previous 12 months doesn't
11	insinuate that it's an annual requirement.
12	Or does mandate, not just insinuate.
13	MS. CAROE: The regulation
14	mandates the annual requirement. It's there
15	It's already existing.
16	MS. HALL: Right.
17	MS. CAROE: And just to address
18	you, Hue.
19	(Laughter)
20	MS. CAROE: I didn't mean that.
21	We do want this for protection of the
22	consumers at farmer's market, the protection

1	of processors buying ingredients. If that's
2	expired and they're no longer in compliance
3	with their annual monitoring, you know, we
4	don't have a real tool, a real-time tool to
5	look at that right now. So you know, you can
6	have a certificate that's three or four years
7	expired right now without anybody really
8	knowing that, you know. It's issued - the
9	certifier doesn't have a control over that to
10	take that document back from you if they ever
11	de-certify you or suspend you. So you could
12	continue to use it all you want for years.
13	With expiration date, you could do that for a
14	limited time, but you're not going to get
15	another document with the new dates on it, or
16	effective dates.
17	MR. KARREMAN: All right, then I'm
18	confused then. This document being presented
19	is asking to show expiration dates?
20	MS. CAROE: Yes.
21	MR. KARREMAN: Good. Okay.
22	MR. O'RELL: Joe?

MR. SMILLIE: Just one other point and that is that 6-month extension. You know, that's a very useful tool and it doesn't make the certificate less. It really, you know, it does specifically state that document that there's an extension. So with that document in hand at a farmer's market it's valid as a certificate. And it's

- I think six months is reasonable.

I think the certifier community is mixed on this issue, haven't gotten used to the other one and there's a bunch of things, but from my point of view, personally, I can't speak for all the certifiers, it also creates a compliance tool that's really valuable. And again, it was mentioned something it would make sure you get your fees paid on time. Well, that's one issue, but actually that's not the worst one. The worst one is, you know, these non-compliances that are issued to clients. Most clients have a certain level of non-compliances,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	minor. And if they've got their certificate,
2	there's just a lot less compelling need to
3	get back to the certifier and resolve the
4	compliances, you know. They'll do it, but
5	you know, pulling teeth and stretching.
6	Well, you know, we're past our annual
7	monitoring date, we're coming back again, we
8	still haven't gotten this non-compliance
9	corrected. And with the expiration on the
10	certificate I think we'll get better response
11	from well-meaning clients who have some non-
12	compliances to clear up.
13	MR. O'RELL: Valerie.
14	MS. FRANCES: I just think you
15	have a grammatical problem with (b)(2).
16	Effective period of the certificate include -
17	including, and include.
18	MS. CAROE: Which includes.
19	MS. FRANCES: Which includes.
20	MS. CAROE: To include.
21	MS. FRANCES: Okay.
22	MS. CAROE: Thank you.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Dan?

MR. GIACOMINI: Sorry.

MR. O'RELL: No Bea, then Dan.

MS. JAMES: I appreciate the

perspective of looking at how certificates affect somebody like a farmer's market. the retail side I quess I'm just kind of reiterating a little bit of what Joe was If you have certification and saying. actually having that expiration date in keeping track of all of the certificates that you have to try to keep track of, it's very, very cumbersome and difficult to try to manage all the paperwork without the expiration date on the certificate. there's, you know, for some areas it might be better to not have the expiration date, but for the majority of people that actually are using administratively the certificate to help manage certification, it's a positive thing to have the expiration date. So I just wanted to make that point.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. O'RELL: Dan?

MR. GIACOMINI: I appreciate all the work that has been done by the committee on this and I certainly support the overall intent and the general direction. I think there's a lot of positive things that we do here including the issues with inspection and everything. I'm just not quite convinced that putting the expiration date is the best way to go and I think there was enough concern that I heard from certifiers even among the ones who said we need something, and I definitely believe we need something, that personally I would just like us to reconsider this maybe a little bit more.

MR. O'RELL: The Chair will recognize Jim Riddle, past Chair of the NOSB.

I think he wants his job back.

MR. RIDDLE: No, I just want to try and offer a little language change to make it clear that it's the expiration date on the certificate. And if you just consider

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	that it read "the effective period of
2	certification including the effective date
3	and expiration date of the certificate."
4	That separates the issue of expiration of
5	certification because the way it reads right
6	now I think it's unclear, it's confusing.
7	It's lumping the two in the same phrase
8	unless you make it clear that it's the
9	expiration date of the certificate.
10	MR. O'RELL: You're suggesting
11	effective - could you read that one more
12	time?
13	MR. RIDDLE: Yes. The way it
14	reads, effective period of certification,
15	comma, including the - that's just
16	grammatical. So including the effective date
17	and expiration date of the certificate. Is
18	that?
19	MS. JAMES: I accept that.
20	MR. RIDDLE: Okay, thanks. Just
21	trying to be helpful.
22	MR. O'RELL: Always, thank you.

1	The committee is fine with that. Thank you,
2	Jim.
3	MS. JAMES: We miss your
4	wordsmithing, Jim.
5	MR. KARREMAN: Okay. Just one
6	question on that.
7	MR. O'RELL: Yes.
8	MR. KARREMAN: When it says
9	effective period of the certification, the
LO	certification is for life I thought. Like a
11	driver's license. So is that actually, Jim,
12	would that be correct grammatically? Is
13	there an effective period of the
L4	certification? I thought once you're
15	certified, you're certified? Right, but an
L6	effective period would be like Point A to
L7	Point B chronologically.
L8	MR. RIDDLE: You're not certified
L9	for life. You have to keep doing certain
20	things. You have to keep complying. You
21	have to pay your fees. You have to file an
	1

annual update. You have to be reinspected.

1	It's not just a given that because you're
2	still alive you're still certified.
3	(Laughter)
4	MR. KARREMAN: I realize that,
5	Jim. Thank you for that clarification. All
6	right so that seems fine, I mean if
7	everyone's fine with that.
8	MR. O'RELL: Gerry?
9	MR. DAVIS: So this wording change
10	in the Board's opinion does not backtrack on
11	what we were trying to fix a little while ago
12	on this?
13	MR. O'RELL: I think it's
14	providing clarification.
15	MS. CAROE: It's syntax.
16	MR. O'RELL: So I would ask
17	Valerie, because this is the only change
18	we've made in this document that was posted,
19	could you just read one more time what we
20	have up there for clarification?
21	MS. FRANCES: Just that line?
22	MR. O'RELL: Just that line. No,

1	the whole document.
2	MS. FRANCES: The whole section
3	(b)?
4	MR. O'RELL: Just that line. I'm
5	sorry.
6	MS. FRANCES: All right. While
7	the certifying agent must issue a certificate
8	of organic operation which specifies the (2)
9	effective period of certification to include
LO	the effective date and expiration date of the
11	certificate.
L2	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
L3	MS. HALL: Sorry, I just still
L4	think it's murky and I would like to change
15	it to just read effective date and expiration
L6	date of the certificate.
L7	MR. O'RELL: Effective date and
L8	expiration date of the certificate.
L9	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
20	MR. ENGELBERT: I agree with
21	Jennifer and I see Hue's point. It's going
22	to be almost impossible for an agency to

1	specify the certification period on a
2	certificate.
3	MR. O'RELL: Okay, Jennifer is
4	suggesting language. Let's have a
5	discussion.
6	MS. WEISMAN: I would add one word
7	into your phrase. I would say effective date
8	of certification and expiration date of
9	certificate.
LO	MR. O'RELL: Oh, that's good. I
11	like that. Because then we keep it separate
L2	as Jim Riddle had mentioned to do. Okay,
L3	Dan?
L4	MR. GIACOMINI: Could we
15	accomplish the same thing just by changing
L6	"certification" to "certificate" ?
L7	MS. CAROE: That's where we
18	started.
L9	MR. O'RELL: You don't want it
20	lumped together.
21	MS. CAROE: That was like 15
22	minutes ago.

1	MR. O'RELL: I would just like for
2	clarification, again, Valerie, read what was
3	last put up.
4	MR. DAVIS: She doesn't have that
5	down.
6	MS. FRANCES: I wasn't clear what
7	was -
8	MR. O'RELL: You don't? Okay.
9	Then Julie, would you please?
LO	MS. WEISMAN: All right, (b), the
11	certifying agent must issue a certificate of
L2	organic operation which specifies the
L3	effective date of certification and
L4	expiration date of the certificate.
15	MR. O'RELL: Okay. That sounds
L6	good. And the committee accepts that
L7	amendment. Kevin?
18	MR. ENGELBERT: Julie didn't have
L9	a "the" after, and I just wanted to - that
20	"the" needs to be removed.
21	MS. WEISMAN: I admit it. You're
22	right, you're right. Of certificate.

1	Expiration date of the certificate.
2	MR. ENGELBERT: The date of
3	certification.
4	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Do you think
5	you have it?
6	MS. FRANCES: Do I got it?
7	MR. O'RELL: I can't see it.
8	MS. FRANCES: Effective date of
9	certification and the expiration date of the
10	certificate.
11	MR. O'RELL: Yes, bingo, thank
12	you. Okay. Any further discussion? Any
13	conflict of interest to declare?
14	MR. SMILLIE: Well, I work with
15	these documents all the time. I don't think
16	I have a conflict of interest.
17	MR. O'RELL: Just a disclosure
18	that you do work with these documents and
19	you're -
20	MR. SMILLIE: Oh. Every day.
21	MR. O'RELL: Yes.
22	MR. SMILLIE: I work with these

1	documents every day and I'm disclosing that I
2	work with these documents every day. I don't
3	have a conflict of interest. I have no
4	material gain to make.
5	MR. O'RELL: That's fine, we
6	accept that Joe, you don't have to - we just
7	- it's not an inquisition. Okay. We're
8	going to - we have a motion, we have
9	seconded, we're voting on accepting the
10	recommendation from the CAC on expiration
11	dates on certificates of organic operation as
12	amended. And we'll start the vote with Mike.
13	MR. LACY: Yes.
14	MR. O'RELL: Hue?
15	MR. KARREMAN: Yes.
16	MR. O'RELL: Rigo?
17	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
18	MR. O'RELL: Gerald?
19	MR. DAVIS: Yes.
20	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
21	MR. SMILLIE: Yes.
22	MR. O'RELL: Bea?

1	MS. JAMES: Yes.
2	MR. O'RELL: Andrea?
3	MS. CAROE: Yes.
4	MR. O'RELL: Julie?
5	MS. WEISMAN: Yes.
6	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
7	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes.
8	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
9	MS. HALL: Yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: Jeff?
11	MR. MOYER: Yes.
12	MR. O'RELL: Kevin?
13	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
14	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
15	MR. GIACOMINI: No.
16	MR. O'RELL: And the Chair votes
17	yes. With 13 yes, one no, the motion
18	carries.
19	MS. CAROE: Who seconded?
20	MR. O'RELL: Nancy. And I thank
21	the CAC and we have concluded the voting on
22	recommendations to the program. Well, I'd

1	like to at least move on with, because we did
2	take a rather extensive break and we're a
3	little behind schedule. But I understand if
4	somebody needs to shuffle back and forth we
5	can do that. I'd like to continue at least
6	with the presentation of the committee work
7	plans by the Chairs. If we have a volunteer
8	to go first, who's ready?
9	MR. DELGADO: Mr. Chair, I'm
10	ready.
11	MR. O'RELL: Rigo. Rigo's ready
12	to go.
13	MR. DELGADO: Mr. Chair, members
14	of the Board, we have four items on the plan
15	here. The first one is to finalize the new
16	member guide. We need to include a couple of
17	sections there that involve the NOP. The
18	second item is to set up the research
19	variance ad hoc committee. That's working
20	together with members of the Crops and
21	Livestock Committee as well as the PDC.

Third item on the list is continue with our

work in temporary research variances.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Essentially we want to finalize the guidance for certification of operations participating in research. That's the document that we need to finalize.

Last item includes updates to the Policy and Procedures Manual. We have four general specific actions there. The first one is a follow-up of an item that we've been carrying on since last year and that's developing a clarification of deferral. we hope to complete this this time. one is developing procedures for the transition of committee Chairs. It was obvious in this session that we need to put something in place. Then we also need to update the NOSB committee recommendation form to specify the uses of petitioned materials. So we would like to include that in the And finally we just would like to review the general format of the PPM, Policy and Procedures Manual, to make sure that we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	have consistency throughout and the nice
2	introductory paragraphs to each section. So
3	that is the plan for us. If you have any
4	questions.
5	MR. O'RELL: I would like to see
6	maybe we could add a format for putting
7	together recommendations? Oh, I'm sorry.
8	MS. CAROE: No, that was for
9	materials only, but you're talking about
10	other recommendations as well?
11	MR. O'RELL: You're talking about
12	for materials format?
13	MR. DELGADO: That's correct, yes,
14	and you were talking about?
15	MR. O'RELL: Well, I think maybe
16	that would cover it. I'm sorry I missed
17	that. I spaced out. So, okay. Bea?
18	MS. JAMES: I wanted to make sure
19	that I understood you correctly, Rigo. We
20	had talked about putting together the
21	succession plan. Is that what you meant when
22	vou were talking about committee Chairs?

1	MR. DELGADO: That is correct,
2	yes.
3	MS. JAMES: Okay. And did you
4	also have on there putting together
5	procedures for presenting committee action
6	items and recommendations?
7	MR. DELGADO: No, I did not in
8	those specific words. And you did mention
9	that in your -
10	MS. JAMES: Yes, I would like to
11	add that.
12	MR. DELGADO: Absolutely.
13	MS. JAMES: And lastly, I would
14	also like to continue to work with the NOP on
15	the removed section from the new member
16	guide.
17	MR. DELGADO: Yes, that's what I
18	meant by the first point. Yes.
19	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
20	MS. OSTIGUY: Can I make a
21	suggestion on the committee recommendations
22	for materials that there be space to actually

1	write out specifically what the motion is.
2	MS. CAROE: Yes, that's like top
3	on the list.
4	MS. OSTIGUY: Yes. It's a piece
5	that I've found very missing.
6	MR. DELGADO: Yes.
7	MR. O'RELL: Good.
8	MR. DELGADO: Good, thank you.
9	MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Rigo.
LO	Crops? Gerald?
11	MR. DAVIS: The Crops Committee
12	work plan is, number one, to participate in
L3	the ad hoc committee set up by Policy
L4	Development to continue the work on the
L5	research variance document. And, number two,
L6	accomplish the information-gathering on
L7	hydroponics solicited from the certifiers and
L8	analyze the information and discuss whether
L9	to proceed with the guidance document.
20	Number three, continuing petitions: potassium
21	silicate, possibly sulfuric acid in manure,

depending on the petitioner's response. New

1	petitions: pelargonic acid, sodium carbonate
2	peroxyhydrate, sodium ferric hydroxy EDTA,
3	sorbitol octanoate, sulfurus acid, and
4	tetracycline.
5	MR. O'RELL: Any questions for
6	Gerald and the Crops Committee?
7	MS. CAROE: Can you just repeat
8	that first item on your Crops list?
9	MR. DAVIS: Pelargonic acid.
10	MS. CAROE: No, no, the first
11	item.
12	MR. DAVIS: First item? I'm
13	sorry. To participate in the ad hoc
14	committee.
15	MS. CAROE: Okay thank you.
16	MR. DAVIS: To continue work on
17	the temporary research variance document.
18	MR. O'RELL: Any other questions
19	for Gerald and the Crops Committee? Thank
20	you, Gerald. Mike, want to move to?
21	MR. KARREMAN: I have a question.
22	MR. O'RELL: Yes, Hue.

1	MR. KARREMAN: You mentioned
2	tetracycline as the very last word there. Is
3	that - was that - did that go through sunset?
4	So is that going to be?
5	MR. DAVIS: There is a petition
6	for expanded use. I haven't seen it yet, but
7	it's on the list.
8	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Mike?
9	MR. LACY: Thank you, Kevin.
10	We're - Livestock Committee is working on its
11	succession plan and Hue is going to present
12	our work plan.
13	MR. KARREMAN: Secession?
14	Succession.
15	MR. LACY: We're going to secede,
16	yes.
17	MR. O'RELL: He's from the South.
18	MS. CAROE: He is from the South.
19	(Laughter)
20	MR. KARREMAN: All right,
21	Livestock Committee work plan includes our,
22	well, our main focus and priority will be to

move forward with the process of drafting the organic aquiculture standards. And Kevin Engelbert and myself will be working with Andrea and Joe on that towards writing a document that hopefully we can have a draft standard prepared by next spring, the spring meeting 2007. And then the aquiculture working group is going to continue to work on recommendations for shellfish and we'll continue to work with them as they finalize those, but at this point we can't provide anyone with a timeframe unfortunately.

And as was mentioned yesterday, we definitely look forward to bring closure to the pasture issue and remain ready to assist the NOP in any way possible at any time.

Likewise we look forward to the ANPR from the NOP relative to the dairy animal replacement dilemma. And we have, you know, formally submitted a guidance statement asking for a single acquisition method, namely the last third of gestation after you're certified, no

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

matter how you were certified or when. And again, we stand ready to help in any way.

And we'll be working with the NOP to see what we can do to assure future annotations like the withdrawal times for medications can be applied to materials. In other words, hopefully we can help if there's process in the FDA and whatnot.

Oh, and also we've had the issue of defining better what outdoor access for poultry means on our work plan for a year, but we simply haven't had the time because of the aquiculture issue, the pasture symposium and all that went with that, and also the dairy replacement issue. And as time allows we will work on that issue of poultry outdoor access. And finally we'll also work with Rigo on defining research variances appropriate for organic livestock.

MR. O'RELL: Any questions for Hue? Bea?

MS. JAMES: The pasture symposium

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	that we had was extremely valuable for I
2	think the entire Board. I don't want to
3	speak for everybody, but I know it was for me
4	and I think it was for everyone else. And I
5	see aquiculture as being a pretty complex
6	issue, and we had a lot of really excellent
7	comments and expertise that came up and
8	helped enlighten us. And I would like to ask
9	if it is possible for the NOP to consider a
10	symposium on aquiculture for the NOSB. And
11	I'm inserting that in with Livestock because
12	I would see that that would be something that
13	you would work on in conjunction with
14	Livestock. If we could do that in Hawaii.
15	(Laughter)
16	MR. O'RELL: I agree, Bea. Kevin,
17	did you have a?
18	MR. ENGELBERT: Just that we could
19	make a motion right now for that.
20	MR. O'RELL: Mark, did you have a
21	comment on that?

MR. BRADLEY: I'm not real sure.

Are you asking me if you're going to ask that, or are you asking me now and want an answer now?

MS. JAMES: No, I'm asking if you would consider a symposium on aquiculture. I think that there's a lot more that we need to learn.

MR. BRADLEY: They're similar but very different issues. The level of concern that existed and the amount of controversy that surrounded pasture lent itself very well to a very public hearing with a lot of input from a lot of different sources that supported the direction that the program's taking and the way that the Board was able to respond to all that. It was also very expensive. I think we probably spent upwards of \$70,000 out of a fixed budget that we have for federal advisory committee activity. not going to say no, and maybe something that's of a more controlled scale in conjunction with the Board meeting again.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would not be opposed to something like that.

Is that a - did I dodge that bullet?

MS. JAMES: Can I respond? I guess I would just, I mean I'm not sure if we need something to the extent of pasture even though I wouldn't rule it out. But if there were the opportunity to have an hour or two of people in the aquiculture industry at one of our meetings to be able to help give us more guidance I think it would be very valuable. Because I see it as an extremely important issue.

MR. BRADLEY: Agreed.

MR. O'RELL: Mike?

MR. LACY: Kevin, I think Bea's got a good point. I think the aquiculture will be different than the pasture in that there are few areas of contention in aquiculture and many areas where everybody agrees on probably the direction that we're going to go with aquiculture. So I think really on a really scaled-down version we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	could have experts come in to talk on those
2	particular stumbling areas and not have to go
3	to the extent of a symposium and all the
4	expense on that. We actually talked about
5	trying to bring George Lockwood to this
6	meeting to address the group and decided that
7	it would be better to wait until we get those
8	draft standards together and then have him
9	come. So I think Bea's got a good point but
10	it probably doesn't need to go to a symposium
11	level. It can probably go to some experts
12	that we call in.
13	MS. JAMES: Just one more response
14	then I'll leave it alone. I just want to
15	respond to that, that the advantage of
16	actually having a focused time is that these
17	people that do come in get more than five or
18	ten minutes and I think that that's valuable.
19	MR. LACY: Yes, I agree with that.
20	MR. O'RELL: Nancy?
21	MS. OSTIGUY: We've done this in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the past on different topics where we've

1	asked experts to come in to speak to the
2	Board and it has been for an extended period
3	of time but it's short of a full symposium.
4	MR. KARREMAN: Right, for instance
5	like the FDA guys that came.
6	MR. O'RELL: Jennifer?
7	MS. HALL: I do think this one's a
8	little bit different too in the sense that
9	livestock has been included under the rule up
10	to now so I feel like we're more intimate
11	with that community and they know how to use
12	the system a little bit better. And I think
13	that that opportunity should be afforded to a
14	whole new community of producers and that
15	there actually might be more heightened
16	concern than we're aware. If we open that
17	door a little bit we might be able to cut it
18	off at the pass and avoid getting there by
19	being backed in the corner.
20	MR. O'RELL: Dan?
21	MR. GIACOMINI: I totally agree
22	with the idea that Bea is proposing. I would

1	just like to make a technical correction and
2	shift it to the Executive Committee as a
3	possible work plan because we do have some
4	other possible things that we're going to be
5	going to NOP with that may alter how we're
6	requesting their use of limited funds in the
7	next year.
8	MR. O'RELL: Joe?
9	MR. SMILLIE: Yes, I'm new to the
10	process so my question is it comes down to
11	our time, which we seem to be freely willing
12	to give. The other question is money and I'm
13	just wondering does this have to be funded
14	through current funds? I think that industry
15	could fund a symposium under our direction.
16	I don't know if that's possible.
17	MR. KARREMAN: Are you offering
18	that from QAI?
19	MR. SMILLIE: No, no, no.
20	(Laughter)
21	MR. SMILLIE: I'm just saying the
22	aquiculture industry per se and the groups

there. I'm just asking. If money's the issue and we can't do it because of our limited budget are there just other ways to create the symposium. Not the control of it, just the funding of it. That's what's done in the private sector at all times. I'm attending a food safety conference in Wisconsin that's run by the university and it's funded by private sources.

MR. O'RELL: Rigo?

MR. DELGADO: I wouldn't like that idea being expanded. I would like to really exhaust the possibilities that we're getting funding from the NOP simply because we might have some misinterpretations that we have private funding coming to support this activity. And we really need to have extremely objective information thrown at us.

MR. O'RELL: Well, maybe this is something on the work plan and Livestock you can seek counsel with the Policy Development Committee and come back with a recommendation

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

after you've thought out several of the options that have been discussed here. I think that a lot of good things have been thrown on the table. So I would still put it back on the Livestock committee to come back and seek advice from the Policy Development Committee as well as what some recommendations might be appropriate going forward. Thank you. CAC?

MS. CAROE: We only have three things on our list. First item is to follow up with the deferred recommendation that we have on standard certificate format. The second item is to continue the work on peer review process, peer review procedure in collaboration with the program investigating all the alternatives and their benefits to the program, to the community. And lastly, we're going to follow up on that July 2001 recommendation for rule change that was referenced during this meeting. That's it.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Andrea.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Any questions for Andrea? Bea?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. JAMES: I would also like to add to the committee work plan looking at defining the role of retail certification when it comes to private label products. Because we had talked about defining that a little bit better. The role of the actual retailer. Because currently in the guidance document that we put out we said that if somebody seeks voluntary certification and they want to use that certifying information on the final product, that they can do that and they inherit the responsibilities that come with doing that. However, in the case of a retailer, you have several departments, and if one department is certified it's a separate issue. It's a separate issue, and so I'm proposing it as a separate issue that we look at defining that if you're certified in one little area, you can't go and use that on a final product. We have to define that better.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. CAROE: We accept that
2	addition to the work plan to define
3	certification of retail establishments and
4	all the specifics that go along with that.
5	MS. JAMES: Thank you.
6	MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Bea.
7	Thank you, Andrea. Julie from the Handling
8	Committee, please.
9	MS. WEISMAN: There's a lot more
10	on my list than yours. That doesn't seem
11	fair. Number one, I have reviewing petitions
12	as complete petitions are given from the
13	program. And I actually, there's 44 things
14	on the list right now by my count, so I am
15	not going to list them all individually if
16	that's okay with everyone.
17	MR. O'RELL: That's fine. We know
18	they're on your work plan.
19	MS. WEISMAN: Okay. Number two is
20	the re-work of ag/non-ag. We've specified a
21	lot yesterday and today about what still

needs to be done so I won't go into the

details right now. Also, awaiting patiently the green light to continue our work on synthetic/non-synthetic. That's the third item. Fourth item is to now take the report of the Pet Food Task Force and begin the task of how to make them into standards. Five, I still need to appoint a Vice Chair. I haven't had a Vice Chair all year, so that's a task. And respond to NOP Q&A's as needed.

One other, commercial availability

One other, commercial availability
I did not put on this list. I'm very happy
that that's not here anymore, but there is
one little item that is remaining. The item
that we struck this morning needs to be
addressed and I propose that because it's a
certifier, it's about the certifier's role, I
propose that either it be moved to the CAC's
work plan or that we form an ad hoc committee
including certification and handler committee
members.

MS. CAROE: What was the issue again?

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. WEISMAN: The issue was how
2	much information and in what form can the
3	certifier give to either their clients or
4	certified applicant without running afoul of
5	conflict of interest.
6	MR. GIACOMINI: The deleted number
7	three we took a break for.
8	MS. CAROE: We accept that
9	addition to our list, reluctantly.
10	MS. WEISMAN: Is that it? That's
11	it for Handling Committee.
12	MR. O'RELL: Any questions for
13	Handling Committee? Thank you, Julie.
14	MS. FRANCES: Actually, I have one
15	thing. Do you want to clarify the petitioned
16	materials versus 606 or 605, all of it?
17	MS. WEISMAN: All of it. I mean,
18	I will make a note that their one item has a
19	little flashing light for me which is a
20	605(a) material, fructoogliosaccharides
21	because that's been in the pipeline for
22	awhile and now there is a TAP review complete

1	so we actually have everything that we need
2	now. It may even have been the case before
3	this meeting but we had our nose to the
4	grindstones on other things, so I will note
5	that I'm aware that this is an item that is
6	now ready for committee review for the next
7	meeting.
8	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Any other
9	questions for Julie?
10	MS. WEISMAN: Is that enough?
11	MR. O'RELL: That's fine. Thank
12	you, Julie. Dan, Materials?
13	MR. GIACOMINI: The work plan for
14	the Materials Committee is to manage and
15	proceed with the petition process for 606
16	petition items and other section petitioned
17	items in cooperation with the respective
18	committees that they are involved with. To
19	cooperate with the Executive Committee to
20	coordinate any additional possible meetings
21	that we can arrange through the program to

help us through the 606 process in a timely

1	fashion. To cooperate with the Handling
2	Committee on the continuation of the ag/non-
3	ag document and to move forward with the
4	synthetic/non-synthetic document as it's
5	allowed.
6	MR. O'RELL: Any questions for
7	Dan, Material Chair?
8	MS. CAROE: Just you have the 606
9	process but you also - a standing item is to
10	follow up with the petitions that are in the
11	queue somewhere? I mean, not just 606 but
12	all petitions.
13	MR. GIACOMINI: No, it was all
14	other section petitioned items also.
15	MS. CAROE: Okay.
16	MR. GIACOMINI: I just - rather
17	than saying "all items," I made a note that
18	606 was a particular priority.
19	MS. CAROE: Okay.
20	MR. GIACOMINI: The -
21	MS. CAROE: Well, but you also
22	have the process, the flow chart of 606.

1	MR. GIACOMINI: Well, what I'm
2	referring to is the process of getting them
3	approved. That's what I'm referring to as
4	the process.
5	MS. CAROE: Okay. Then I would
6	suggest the addition of the flow chart for
7	606 with the timeline for the 606 review
8	process.
9	MR. GIACOMINI: We said that.
10	MR. O'RELL: Any additional
11	questions for Dan? I'm sorry, Joe, I didn't
12	see you.
13	MR. SMILLIE: What hasn't come up
14	in the discussion on the 606 process? Again,
15	maybe I'm a little fuzzy on it, but what is
16	the status of the expedited review process?
17	MS. CAROE: Emergency provision?
18	MR. SMILLIE: Emergency
19	provisions, yes. We haven't talked about
20	that the last three days, and I remember that
21	was a fairly interesting item that we never
1	

got any kind of firm response from the

1 program on. I just thought I should - at 2 least, I can't recall us talking about it at all. 3 MR. O'RELL: Andrea? 4 It is my understanding 5 MS. CAROE: that the emergency provision is a function of 6 7 the program and not of the Board. So I don't - although we want to be informed on it, I 8 don't believe, unless somebody at the program 9 10 tell me if you're waiting for us to take action on this, but I kind of feel like we're 11 going to react to what the program does on 12 13 that. MR. SMILLIE: That's my 14 15 understanding also, but I guess what I would ask for is an update from the program on 16 their current thinking on this issue. 17 MR. BRADLEY: Part of what we have 18 19 been thinking on this issue is to see how the process settles out with what the Board wants 20 to do and what the level of their involvement 21

would be with an expedited process.

becoming apparent to me that we're going to really need one if we're going to keep some of these things available for use by the industry. And anything that we do, that we develop at the program level we will absolutely do it in collaboration with the Board. I'm discussing working with the various committees and the Executive Committee on how we're going to move these materials through the process quickly and to see what kind of legal corner-cutting we can do to get them out there for that one year allowance that would give them additional time to be more thoroughly reviewed. But we would work with the Board on that.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Mark. I think this is certainly going to be one of the biggest priorities of the Board going forward is tackling the queue of materials that are on 605 and 606 particularly. And Dan, I guess we'd look to you and your work plan on the Materials Committee to be working

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the program in collaboration to see how we can move this through on a priority basis and how we can expedite, including the timing of the next meeting, the time needed for the Board to review these petitions and to get them through their paces for recommendations, but that we have a public meeting that allows the program sufficient time following that meeting to be able to go through the rule—making process. That's certainly, Dan, a priority both with the Materials Committee and the Executive Committee I think needs to spearhead. Thank you. Any other comments?

MS. HALL: I have one. I wasn't sure if there was an Executive Committee report, but I actually like the suggestion and based on a number of the items we've talked about today as far as expediting processes like this and potentially holding an aquiculture symposium that I'd like to suggest that the program and the Executive

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Committee work together to reinstate perhaps an annual budget report just so that there's a little more understanding of what prioritizing needs there might be or where the struggles are or what the sacrifices are to making certain decisions. I don't know how detailed that needs to be, but at least a little more information.

MR. O'RELL: I think that that's a good comment and certainly something that we could put on for discussion with the program on the next Executive Committee call. Thank you. Any other questions or comments about work plan items? Hearing none we'll go to the next portion of our agenda, recognition of outgoing Board members. And I'm not going to comment on myself, but I think Mark has - I'll turn it over to Mark Bradley and the program.

MR. BRADLEY: We changed our mind. You can't go.

(Laughter)

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. BRADLEY: Someone got up the
2	other - I don't remember who the commenter
3	was. I think it was the lady that commented
4	a couple of times that she was a consumer, a
5	real consumer coming to these meetings and
6	throwing herself amongst the midst of all the
7	activities and seeing what was going on. And
8	there were on numerous occasions her and
9	others, there's this awe that was cast upon
10	the Board that you guys are the leaders of
11	the organic world. This is - and it's true.
12	The level of responsibility that has been
13	placed on you and accepted by the Board
14	members and the level of commitment for five
15	years. Five years. You know what happens ir
16	five years? We have presidents that don't
17	last that long. We have changes of
18	administration. I mean, who appointed you,
19	Kevin? Was that Veneman still?
20	MR. O'RELL: Yes, it was Veneman.
21	MR. BRADLEY: So it was, things

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

have changed and you have been tasked with

adapting your responsibilities and your recommendations and your research to the prevailing political and economic and production climate. It's been a daunting task for the three folks that are leaving, Mike and Kevin and Nancy. The level of commitment, and I'm glad to see that the industry and the consuming public appreciates what you have done and places you in such high esteem. Because in five years, you know, you can go from having no children to toddlers and children in preschool and you can go from no grandchildren. You've given up parts of your lives in five years, sacrificed your careers.

(Laughter)

MR. BRADLEY: I didn't mean it like you've given up your careers. Well there's no way to back out of that one, is there? But given of your professional time and your personal time. So I want to thank you, the three of you in particular that are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

finishing up your stints or however you want to view those. I'm not going to ask you if you would do it over. If you had the chance to do it over again if you would, because we have prospective nominees for this position in the audience. And I really don't want to dissuade them by saying too much negative about what's gone on, but I know there have been a lot of choices made.

Nancy and Kevin and Mike, I know there have been instances where you have not been able to make it to meetings because you had to make tough choices, and I really want to thank you for the times where you did choose to work for the NOSB. And the public service I know is a privilege and a responsibility, but there's a lot to be gained I hope for you of the time that you've sacrificed, the professional notoriety that you've gained and earned, the respect that you've provided or earned from the organic community and from the program. We will be

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	tapping your brains. I think there's a lot
2	to be said to the amount of asking that we're
3	still going to come to you with as far as for
4	your help, for your guidance, your continued
5	support. Old Board members, you know, don't
6	go away. And we hope you don't, in
7	particular. And we don't want you to either.
8	But is there anything that you would like to
9	offer as far as comments? We have of course
10	our tokens of appreciation that are something
11	you can hang on your wall and be proud of and
12	take pictures of and put on your websites and
13	show to your grandkids and possibly use to
14	explain why you have been gone from their
15	lives so much. It's not much, but it's
16	something that we would like you to have.
17	That would be a good idea, if you all would
18	come up. Let's add some structure to this.
19	Let's just let Dennis choreograph this.

The conscription here says - conscription, that's like inscription. It's a certificate of appreciation from the U.S.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

20

21

Department of Agriculture presented to Kevin O'Rell and Michael Lacy and Nancy Ostiguy for five years of dedicated service as a member of the USDA's National Organic Standards Board from 2002 to 2007. So this is the class of 2007.

(Applause)

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you guys.

MR. O'RELL: Mark, on a personal note I thank you very much. It's certainly been a privilege and an honor for me to serve on this Board. It's been quite an experience and five years as you say is a lot of time. It was one hell of a learning process as well and I know that for the new Board members I would say that, you know, that first year it's tough. But I've got to look around this room and say that I'm really pleased with the contribution that the freshman class has contributed to this Board. I'd also like to on a personal note certainly thank Mike and thank Nancy for serving together for the 5-

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

year period of time. We're the three left of the five that started and we made it to graduation. And it is a lot of work and effort that both of you have put in and contributed, and I appreciate that very much. It's been an honor to serve with both of you.

It's also for me been great to serve with some of the Board members that are in the audience that I was privileged to be on the Board with them. So you've got current members and you've got past members at the same time. It's kind of an exclusive club, but I think there's a bond that really forms with Board members and as you exit the Board, you're not really gone. I mean, hopefully you're still involved in the organic community and people will seek your input and you can still make a contribution. So I thank all of you.

MS. OSTIGUY: I also want to just say a couple of words. I've very much

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

enjoyed the time on the Board. Yes, there were some interesting experiences. I'm interested to hear how Kevin described that first year because it reminds me of the same thing that people say when they begin teaching. The first year is overwhelming. After that, it's okay. And actually, the learning process was incredibly enjoyable. It was very, very interesting. Always interesting to hear someone else's point of view and many of times be persuaded. Working with the NOP has been wonderful. A group of people that know how to shepherd things through the federal process which many of us don't have experience with and it's been a great partnership. Thank you, everybody.

(Applause)

MR. LACY: Kevin, I will be very brief. It has been, as Nancy and you both have said so eloquently, it has been an honor and a privilege to serve on this Board, especially with the people on this Board, and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I appreciate very much the friendships that I have gained and the knowledge that I have gained and the opportunity to be a part of this very dedicated and very committed group of people. Thank you.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. O'RELL: Okay and with that I think we'll move on to election of officers.

I know we want to kind of keep on track because I know some people have made plane reservations based on us adjourning on time at 12:30 so we want to kind of stick with it if Board members are okay with that. So we will start with there are three offices that we will hold elections for, the Chair, the Vice Chair and the Secretary. And let's start with the Chair position. We'll entertain any nominations to the floor for the position of Chair.

MR. KARREMAN: I'd like to nominate Andrea Caroe for Chair of the NOSB.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MS. WEISMAN: Second. Oh, we
2	don't have to do that, do we?
3	MR. O'RELL: Technically we don't
4	have to second the nomination, but that's
5	good to know there's support. Andrea, do you
6	accept the nomination?
7	MS. CAROE: I accept the
8	nomination.
9	MR. O'RELL: Are there any
LO	additional nominations for Chair position?
11	MR. LACY: I move that nominations
12	be closed and that we elect Andrea by
L3	acclimation.
L4	MR. O'RELL: That we need to
15	second.
L6	MR. ENGELBERT: I'll second that.
L7	MR. O'RELL: Kevin seconded. We
18	have a motion to close nominations and cast a
L9	unanimous ballet for Andrea as Chair. All
20	those in favor, aye?
21	(Chorus of ayes)
22	MR. O'RELL: Opposed?

1	(Silence)
2	MR. O'RELL: Andrea,
3	congratulations.
4	(Applause)
5	MR. O'RELL: We will go to Vice
6	Chair position and accept nominations for
7	Vice Chair. Do I have any nominations at
8	this time from the floor?
9	MR. MOYER: I nominate Gerald
LO	Davis as Vice Chair.
11	MR. O'RELL: We have a nomination
12	for Gerald Davis. Gerald, do you accept the
L3	nomination?
L4	MR. DAVIS: I accept.
L5	MR. O'RELL: Thank you.
L6	MR. MOYER: I nominate Julie
L7	Weisman.
18	MR. O'RELL: We have a nomination
L9	for Julie Weisman. Julie?
20	MS. WEISMAN: I accept.
21	MR. O'RELL: You accept. Are
22	there any other nominations from the floor?

1	Seeing no additional nominations from the
2	floor we have two nominations, Gerald Davis
3	and Julie Weisman for Vice Chair. So we will
4	have a ballot. We can use these, everybody
5	has them, they're the same size. So what I
6	would ask is that everybody cast a vote and
7	then I would ask the secretary if you would
8	collect and tabulate the results. Do we have
9	to go in a secret room to do this?
10	MR. DELGADO: No chance.
11	MS. CAROE: I feel like Survivor.
12	(Laughter)
13	MR. O'RELL: Okay, the results of
14	the election by the Board is that Julie
15	Weisman has been elected for Vice Chair of
16	the NOSB. Congratulations, Julie.
17	(Applause)
18	MR. O'RELL: And Gerry, let me say
19	there's three more years to go on the Board,
20	so.
21	MR. DAVIS: I'm not worried.
22	MR. O'RELL: Thank you. Thank you

1	all. Now the next position is Secretary.
2	Are there any nominations for Secretary?
3	Yes, Andrea?
4	MS. CAROE: I would like to
5	nominate Bea James for the position of
6	Secretary?
7	MR. O'RELL: Bea, will you accept
8	the nomination? Bea accepts the nomination.
9	Are there any additional nominations for
10	Secretary?
11	MR. LACY: I would move that
12	nominations be closed and that we elect Bea
13	by acclimation.
14	MS. WEISMAN: Second.
15	MR. O'RELL: It has been moved and
16	seconded that nominations be closed and that
17	we vote to unanimously accept Bea for the
18	position of Secretary. All those in favor?
19	(Chorus of ayes)
20	MR. O'RELL: Opposed?
21	(Silence)
22	MR. O'RELL: Bea, congratulations,

1	another year.
2	(Applause)
3	MR. SMILLIE: Sisterhood.
4	MS. CAROE: Charlie's Angels.
5	(Laughter)
6	MR. O'RELL: Oh, other business
7	and closing comments. Before we go around
8	and have closing comments I will ask is there
9	any other business that needs to be addressed
10	by any Board members?
11	MS. CAROE: We have two items.
12	One we have to address committee chairs.
13	MR. O'RELL: Thank you.
14	MS. CAROE: And then the other
15	thing that we have to address is scheduling
16	the next meeting.
17	MR. O'RELL: Okay, committee
18	chairs.
19	MS. CAROE: In taking on the role
20	of Chair of this Board, I am going to step
21	down from Chair of the CAC and I have asked
22	Joe Smillie to take on that role as Chair of

1	CAC.
2	MR. SMILLIE: I don't recall being
3	asked.
4	(Laughter)
5	MR. SMILLIE: But accepted.
6	MR. O'RELL: Accepted, okay.
7	MS. CAROE: And the other position
8	that has come open with the leaving of
9	Michael as Chair of the Livestock Committee,
10	it leaves vacancy in that committee for a
11	Chair. And I have asked Hue to take on that
12	role as Chair of the Livestock Committee.
13	MR. KARREMAN: Happy to and I
14	would also like to ask if Kevin Engelbert
15	could be my Vice Chair.
16	MR. ENGELBERT: Yes.
17	MR. KARREMAN: Done deal.
18	MS. CAROE: And then all remaining
19	Chairs will stay the same at this time.
20	Committees will remains as are listed at this
21	time pending the new members in the next

couple of months and we'll look at the

staffing of each of the committees and possibly make adjustments at that time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. O'RELL: Okay. Thank you, Andrea. In terms of setting a meeting date for the next meeting, and I know that we have tried both ways where we all get our calendars out and wrestle back and forth and get nowhere in terms of when the next meeting In the past, the program has sent a date is. calendar of available dates or asking for people's availability and then they compare that master calendar and try to come back with the recommendations on the Executive Committee that we will take care of for the next meeting. I would entertain discussion, though, in terms of timing for the next meeting. Andrea?

MS. CAROE: Well, I would like to pose a question to the program. We have requested two meetings this coming spring to accommodate the numerous materials we have for 606 in order to get those materials dealt

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	with prior to the June `07 deadline. And I
2	just again want to check and see if there's
3	any possibility of accommodating perhaps a
4	February and an April meeting for 2007.
5	MR. BRADLEY: We have discussed
6	this. This is Mark Bradley. There are
7	several options that we can take as far as
8	making sure that we have enough Board time to
9	process the petitions and get them worked
10	through the system in a timely manner.
11	February is a possibility either as a work
12	session or a full Board meeting. A closed
13	work session, there's options there. The
14	April Board meeting was set up for somewhere
15	on the West Coast to get out of D.C. in
16	April.
17	MS. CAROE: That's the west coast
18	of Hawaii?
19	(Laughter)
20	MR. BRADLEY: So those are the two
21	dates that we had considered. And yes, we
22	think that you're probably going to need to

1	have a February at least work session or
2	Board meeting.
3	MR. O'RELL: I think I would
4	prefer, and I won't be here, but as opposed
5	to a work session I really think it needs to
6	be a meeting because they need to move
7	materials forward in terms of the public to
8	vote. So that would be my outgoing two
9	cents.
10	MR. BRADLEY: Well, we may - in
11	order to expedite things, you know, to take
12	advantage of the historical knowledge that
13	you and some of the other Board members may
14	have that are outgoing, we would invite you
15	back possibly. But we can work on that on a
16	case-by-case basis.
17	MR. O'RELL: Sure.
18	MR. BRADLEY: If you would
19	volunteer for that.
20	MR. O'RELL: I would absolutely.
21	MR. BRADLEY: Just as we often
22	have Kim Dietz for her historical information

1	with all our materials. If that's possible.
2	But we can discuss that.
3	MR. O'RELL: Yes, absolutely. I'd
4	be open to that.
5	MS. CAROE: So can we schedule a
6	meeting at this time or are we going to just
7	do this by email?
8	MR. O'RELL: Well, I think it's
9	probably easier to do it by email to send out
10	some dates of a calendar from the program and
11	then have people fill in only the times that
12	they're restricted that they cannot do it.
13	In the past that has worked and then the
14	program will tabulate that and will get back.
15	And even then we know we'll have some
16	conflicts but maybe things can move around.
17	Yes, Kevin?
18	MR. ENGELBERT: It's not a
19	conflict and I can't speak for the other
20	producers and I realize the time constraints
21	if we have two meetings how far apart they

have to be. But as a producer, April

1	meetings are extremely difficult for me. I
2	never caught up last year from the April
3	pasture symposium. So even early April makes
4	a difference as opposed to middle or late
5	April for me.
6	MS. CAROE: Is early April good or
7	bad?
8	MR. ENGELBERT: Better. The
9	earlier the better, yes.
10	MR. O'RELL: Any other comments on
11	scheduling for the next meeting?
12	MR. ENGELBERT: But again, I'm
13	just one person, I don't expect everything to
14	change, I just, you know, I will make a
15	meeting whenever it's scheduled, but as
16	everybody looks at their own schedules, that
17	is certainly more accommodating for me as a
18	producer because I have a limited amount of
19	time that I can, you know, get my spring work
20	done.
21	MR. O'RELL: Yes, I don't know
22	holidays as well, that's why I think it's

1	just best if we get a calendar sent out from
2	the program. And let's be sure to list
3	holidays on that program because sometimes
4	it comes and they're not listed. I tend to
5	overlook that and get in trouble. So it
6	would be nice if those are spelled out, then
7	people can put - and I would encourage this
8	to be done quickly, Mark, so that we can get
9	it out while it's fresh and everybody would
10	look at it and respond. By the next
11	Executive Committee meeting which Andrea will
12	be leading then I think it would be
13	appropriate to have a discussion then and fix
14	these dates so that we could work forward.
15	MS. BENHAM: It's also important
16	because I would need to try to locate a
17	hotel.
18	MR. O'RELL: Yes. Say your name
19	for the record.
20	MS. BENHAM: Katherine Benham. I
21	was saying that it is also important because

I will need - I mean, that you guys just kind

1	of like really concentrate on getting that
2	calendar back to Valerie. Just get the
3	information back to her, particularly because
4	I would need to locate a hotel and, you know,
5	try to make sure that you guys, you know,
6	have somewhat a nice hotel. So.
7	MR. O'RELL: There's a request for one
8	with wireless in the meeting room.
9	MS. BENHAM: Yes, yes. And you
10	know if you're going to schedule something in
11	D.C. it can be very difficult, so.
12	MR. O'RELL: Yes. Thank you,
13	Katherine. Any other business before we go
14	to closing comments? Andrea?
15	MS. CAROE: I don't have anything.
16	MR. O'RELL: Well, we're going to
17	end on time, even early, which is good.
18	MS. CAROE: I guess the one
19	comment is this is like the first meeting
20	where at the end of the meeting we still have
21	more audience than we do Board members which

is, you know.

	(Laughter)
--	------------

MS. CAROE: Usually we have like three people sitting out there at this time.

MR. O'RELL: That's true. Yes, Katherine.

MS. BENHAM: I'm sorry, I've got one more thing too. Make sure I get your travel expenses back.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you. If you want your money, be sure to get your expenses in to Katherine. I guess I would just like to say, you know, once again it's for me my last official meeting in the capacity of a Board member and I'd like to thank this Board and past Boards that I served on for all of your help and guidance. It's been a very good time for me. I've enjoyed it and I've learned a lot.

I'd like to thank the public for this meeting in terms of their thoughtful comments. We had a lot of good comments during the comment period. I think you

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

should be commended. The comments were focused on our agenda which is really a good thing because it helps us and you can see the effect that the public comments have on the deliberation and the change in going forth with the recommendations from committees to full Board vote. So we want to encourage that in the future, the participation from

I also want to say that I saw a very good sense of collaboration in a lot of the issues that were discussed at this meeting, collaboration with the NOP both beforehand in bringing recommendations to the floor during the meeting and collaboration with the public in terms of hearing input and working adjustments according to that input which has been good. There's a lot of work ahead on 606. We know that's a real issue. We know that's a priority. I just wanted to let the public know with the sunset of colors we recognize what needs to be done

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the public.

and this Board, the Handling Committee and the officers going forward will take this task on as a huge priority in working with the program as well in any way we can expedite any processes to get through so that we don't leave any materials left hanging.

I'd like to thank the NOP for all of their assistance during the meeting, Valerie for your almost one year I think now of service and thank you very much. that's been a real help to the Board in terms of having Valerie in the Executive Director position as a liaison to the program and assisting us with minutes and scheduling. Very helpful. And I know that that's a role that's evolving and future Boards will get better at using the collaboration and working with you through that process. So I only see that as a very positive. Katherine, thank you so much for all the arrangements that you've made. I know there's a lot of work that goes in behind the scenes in pulling

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	this together so that we can have this
2	meeting. And I'd like to thank Mark and Bob,
3	Arthur and Barbara in absentia. But we thank
4	the full program for your comments and
5	staying with the meeting and helping us
6	through and working with the Board and the
7	public. Before I ask if the NOP has any
8	closing comments, any other Board members
9	have anything to say in closing?
10	MR. LACY: Kevin, on behalf of the
11	outgoing class I want to thank you very much
12	for your very able leadership. Appreciate it
13	very much.
14	MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Mike, I
15	appreciate that. Mark, do you have any
16	comments you'd like to make in closing? I'm
17	sorry, Dan?
18	MR. GIACOMINI: At the April
19	meeting we did get a Board photograph but it
20	was missing two of the members. I would like
21	to ask the Board if we could stay around for

a few more minutes after and get a complete

1	photograph of the entire Board.
2	MR. O'RELL: That would be great.
3	We'll do - I think everybody can accommodate
4	that. Who's going to take the picture?
5	Where's Dennis?
6	MR. GIACOMINI: He left. I mean,
7	even if it's just - we'll get something and
8	I'll get them out to everybody on email.
9	MR. O'RELL: Okay. Thank you.
10	Mark?
11	MR. BRADLEY: Yes, thanks. This
12	finishes up one year with me as the Associate
13	Deputy Administrator. And I just wanted to
14	thank Kevin in particular for - he came into
15	D.C. and we put our heads together for, you
16	know, to try to plot and plan this past year
17	back in January.
18	MR. O'RELL: Yes.
19	MR. BRADLEY: Came in, spent a
20	whole day, worked through lunch and that seed
21	of collaboration has just carried throughout
	1

this whole year. And the Board has been very

free with contacting Valerie. She came along about the same time. And it has been a very enjoyable experience. I'm very excited that Andrea is going to be, you know, following in Kevin's footsteps, or I don't know who's been leading who, but you two have worked very well as a team for the past year and I don't see any disruption in the flow of work or progress that's been made by the Board happening because of this loss of experience, but you'll be gaining some new experience. So we will work very closely with trying to bring in the new people to preserve the work that you've done to close up some recommendations that have been hanging out there for a long time.

And I appreciate the public comment, the frank and candid remarks and recommendations and suggestions and the humor that's been shared with the program. And we take it to heart. Sometimes we don't - we don't necessarily take it personally, but we

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

do listen and it's very much appreciated.
And if you'll stick around we'll try to get a
calendar to you before you get home. And if
anybody has any particular needs that they
want to share with Valerie and I about the
next meeting we can go ahead and get that
process started because we want to get this
scheduled, get Kat going on it and get all
the arrangements made because, you know,
February is not very far off and there's a
lot of work to be done. So we'll have a game
plan put together. That's all, thank you
very much.

MR. O'RELL: Thank you very much, Mark. Andrea?

MS. CAROE: I just want to take this opportunity to thank Kevin in particular for teaching me so much in this last year about leadership and about leading the Board and his cool head and his good heart have just - it's been inspiring to me. And I also would like to thank for the vote of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	confidence. I'm humbled because I work with
2	the most brilliant people on this Board. So
3	I appreciate that and I hope I can live up to
4	that.
5	MR. O'RELL: Thank you, Andrea.
6	And particularly before we close or ask for
7	an adjournment I want to say that I really
8	thank this Board. It's been a great
9	productive year and my officers, Secretary
LO	Bea, I'll get hugs later, and Andrea. So.
11	Seeing no other closing comments I will
L2	accept a motion for adjourn.
L3	MS. WEISMAN: Motion to adjourn.
L4	MR. O'RELL: Is it seconded?
L5	MR. LACY: I would like to second
L6	that.
L7	(Laughter)
18	MR. O'RELL: All those in favor?
L9	(Chorus of ayes)
20	MR. O'RELL: Meeting adjourned.
21	Thank you.
22	(Applause)

1	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
2	went off the record at 12:04 p.m.)
2	

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

4